

16th March, 1923

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

9

VOL. III.

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1923.



**SIMLA
GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1923.**

Legislative Assembly.

The President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR FREDERICK WHYTE, KT.

Deputy President :

SIR JAMSETJEE JEEJEEBHAY, BART., K.C.S.I., M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

RAO BAHADUR TIRUVENKATA RANGACHARIAR, M.L.A.

MAULVI ABUL KASEM, M.L.A.

SIR CAMPBELL RHODES, KT., C.B.E., M.L.A.

SARDAR BAHADUR GAJJAN SINGH, M.L.A.

Secretary :

SIR HENRY MONCRIEFF SMITH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A., I.C.S.

Assistants of the Secretary :

MR. W. T. M. WRIGHT, I.C.S.

MR. L. GRAHAM, I.C.S.

MR. S. C. GUPTA, BAR.-AT-LAW.

MR. G. H. SPENCE, I.C.S.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN SURAJ SINGH, BAHADUR, I.O.M.

THURSDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3437—3438
Message from the Council of State	3439
The Budget—List of Demands ✓	3439—3517
The Mussalman Waqfs Registration Bill	3517—3518

FRIDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3519—3523
The Budget—List of Demands ✓	3523—3556
Message from the Council of State and Bills laid on the Table	3556
The Budget—List of Demands ✓	3556—3597

SATURDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3599—3600
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3600—3604
The Budget—List of Demands ✓	3605—3675

MONDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1923—

Member Sworn	3677
• Questions and Answers	3677—3689
Statement laid on the Table	3690
Unstarred Question and Answer	3690
The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill ✓	3691—3725

TUESDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3727—3729
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3729—3731
Reduction of British Troops in India	3732—3733
The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill ✓	3733—3813
Statement of Business	3813

WEDNESDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1923—

Governor General's Assent to Bills	3815
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill	3815—3829
The Indian Official Secrets Bill	3829
The Abolition of Transportation Bill ✓	3830
The Indian Merchant Shipping Bill	3830—3833
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill	3833—3845
Statement of Demands refused by the Legislative Assembly and restored by the Governor-General in Council ✓	3845
Election of Members for the Public Accounts Committee	3845
The Indian Finance Bill	3846
The Malkharoda and Gaontia Villages Laws Bill	3846—3852
The Legal Practitioners (Women) Bill	3852—3854
Election of Members for the Public Accounts Committee	3854
Amendment of Standing Orders	3854
Statement of Business	3855

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 16th March, 1923.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock.
Mr. President was in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

VENDORS AT N.-W. RAILWAY STATIONS.

565. ***Mr. W. M. Hussanally**: 1. How many Mahomedan and Hindu Vendors of food-stuffs are there on the Sind Section of the North-Western Railway?

2. Are there any rules regulating the vend of food-stuffs on the North-Western Railway?

3. What stuffs are Mahomedan vendors allowed to sell and what the Hindu vendors?

4 (a) Is it a fact that the Railway have recently imposed a license fee upon these vendors?

(b) If so, how much per year?

5. Is it a fact that vendors of food-stuffs at Railway Stations are obliged to pay a sort of annuity to the station staff to propitiate them; and are also required to serve the station staff without remuneration?

6. Do Government propose to appoint a Committee of Officials and Non-Officials to inquire into the complaints against railway servants of corruption and suggest remedies?

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: (1) There are 63 Hindu and 10 Mahomedan vendors on the Sind section of the North-Western Railway.

(2) The reply is in the affirmative.

(3) A list of articles sold by vendors on the station platforms, etc., on the North-Western Railway is being furnished to the Honourable Member separately.

(4) (a) and (b). No license fee is imposed upon vendors on the North-Western Railway.

(5) and (6) The reply is in the negative.

REHABILITATION OF GOVERNMENT PAPER.

566. ***Mr. R. A. Spence**: Will the Government be pleased to state what action they propose to take in regard to the findings of the Committees appointed in 1921 in Bombay and Calcutta to consider the rehabilitation of the 8 per cent. and 3½ per cent. Government Paper?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: After a great deal of enquiry and consideration, Government have come to the conclusion that no specific measure of rehabilitation is practicable and that improvement in the value of these securities must be the gradual result of the general rehabilitation of India's finances.

Mr. Darcy Lindsay: Will the information contained in the Report be published or made available for Members of the Assembly?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: If Members of the Assembly desire it, it can no doubt be published.

Mr. E. A. Spence: May I ask that the information be published? I think it would be most interesting.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Possibly it would be better before answering that question to wait and see what the information is.

GAZETTED APPOINTMENTS IN ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

567. ***Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) The number of Gazetted appointments in the Ordnance Department of Government of India.
- (b) Whether any of these Gazetted appointments is being held by an Indian? If not, why not?
- (c) Whether Government is aware of the grave discontent among Indian Officers drawing a salary of Rs. 200 and more in regard to their claims to Gazetted appointments being overlooked?
- (d) Whether Government will be pleased to consider the advisability of appointing Indians for Gazetted posts in the Ordnance Department of the Government of India including Factories?
- (e) Whether Indians employed in the Ordnance Department including Factories are granted leave under Civil Service Regulations? If not, why not?

Mr. E. Burdon: On the presumption that the Honourable Member's question refers to civilian appointments in the Ordnance Department, the answers to his questions are as follows:

- (a) Twenty-six.
- (b) and (d) None of these appointments is held by an Indian. There is nothing to prevent an Indian from being appointed to any of these posts provided he possesses the requisite qualifications.
- (c) No.
- (e) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. The second part does not arise.

WORKING OF SALT DEPARTMENT.

568. ***Bhai Man Singh:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state which of the salt mines are worked under the Northern India Salt Department and the expenses of which are charged under that heading; and which of these mines are situated in the Punjab?

(b) Which of the officers and other establishment mentioned in demand No. 3, under the heading of the Northern India Salt Department are common to all the mines under the Northern India Salt Department and which are working solely at the Warcha, Khewra, Jammu and other salt mines in the Punjab and at Sambhar, respectively, and what is the total pay drawn by such officers at each of these mines?

(c) Are the accounts of the said mines kept separately and if so, are shares of the pays of the officers common to all the mines adjusted in their accounts and if so, what are the respective shares charged to the account of each mine?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state separately the expenditure on officers establishment and working of the Khewra, Warcha, Jammu and other Punjab salt mines including expenses incurred on preventive establishment and otherwise?

(e) Will the Government be pleased to state separately the income of the said mines?

(f) How much increase of income does the Government expect from these mines by the improvement made during the current year and proposed to be made during the next year (1923-24)?

Mr. A. H. Ley: (a) The salt mines now worked by the Northern India Salt Revenue Department are the Salt Range Mines at Khewra, Warcha and Kalabagh in the Punjab. Other salt sources worked by the Department are the quarries in Jatta, Bahadur Khel and Karak in the Kohat district of the North-West Frontier Province, the evaporation sources of the Sambhar Lake, Didwana and Pachhadra in Rajputana, and the small Eryne works at Sultanpur in the Gurgaon district of the Punjab.

(b) The staff which may be considered common to all the sources mentioned above (that is, mines, quarries and "evaporation" sources) is as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 Commissioner. | } In Central Office. |
| 1 Deputy Commissioner. | |
| 1 Personal Assistant to Commissioner. | |
| 1 Consulting Engineer (temporary). | |
| 16 Clerks, permanent. | |
| 17 Clerks, temporary. | |
| 1 Kotgasht. | |
| 3 Jamadars. | |
| 1 Daftri. | |
| 21 Peons. | |

I will give the Honourable Member a printed list of officers and establishment of the Northern India Salt Revenue Department, which gives in detail information of the staff employed at the different sources and the rates of pay drawn.

(c) The accounts of the said sources are kept separately, but no share of the pay of the officers common to all is adjusted in those accounts.

(d) Figures for each source separately are not available. The expenditure for 1922-23 on officers, establishment and working of the Salt Range Division as a whole including expenses on preventive establishment but

excluding expenditure on bags and despatches (recoverable from traders), as estimated to be as follows:

	Rs.
<i>Salt Range Division.</i>	
Pay of officers	93,000
Pay of establishment	1,97,000
Working charges	11,81,800
TOTAL	14,71,800

(e) The income of the Salt Range Division for 1922-23 is estimated at Rs. 69½ lakhs.

(f) It is impossible to give an estimate with any correctness of the increased output to be anticipated from a portion only of the developments ultimately projected, but the improvement scheme for the Khewra and Warcha mines as a whole aims at an ultimate increase in output of about 40,00,000 maunds annually, which means increased receipts in duty of half a crore at the rates of duty previously in force, *viz.*, Rs. 1-4 a maund and a crore at the rates at present in force.

INSPECTION OF INCOME-TAX ACCOUNTS.

569. ***Bhai Man Singh:** 1. Is the Government aware that paragraph 64 printed on page 105 of the Income Tax Manual, 1922, makes it discretionary for the Income Tax Officers to call for Account Books even after the submission of Audited Statement of Profit and Loss?

2. Is it a fact that this discretion is greatly abused and assesseees are compelled to submit accounts even after they get them audited as provided in the Income Tax Manual?

3. Is the Government aware that such Account Books when submitted pass through several hands, the Munim, the Inspector, the Head Clerk and the Income Tax Officer?

4. Is it a fact that in the majority of cases facts coming to their notice in the course of examination of Account Books are disclosed, to the great detriment of the interest of the assesseees?

5. Is the Government aware that a very respectable firm of Ambala Cantonment is alleged to have suffered through such disclosure and has complained about it to the Income Tax Officer concerned?

6. Are the Government prepared to consider the question of issuing instructions to the Income Tax officers directing them not to call for an inspection of the Account Books of an assessee where the statement of profits and loss has been duly audited by qualified Auditors or at least not to so call for the books unless there are very special reasons which should be recorded in writing for doing so as well as to direct that very serious notice be taken in the case of any such disclosure?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: 1. Sub-section (4) of section 22 of the Income-tax Act empowers the Income-tax Officer to call for such accounts and documents as he may require from any person who is liable to make a return of income.

2. The accounts have to be examined even when an audited statement of profit and loss is produced.

3. Account books produced before an Income-tax Officer may pass through more than one hand in the Income-tax office, but all particulars contained in such accounts are to be kept confidential by the income-tax employees who are liable to be punished under section 54 of the Act for disclosing any such information.

4. No such complaint has been received by the Government.

5. No.

6. An audited profit and loss account is not a correct statement of the profits liable to income-tax, and it does not appear necessary to amplify the instructions contained in paragraph 64 of the Income-tax Manual against the unnecessary detention of the books of an assessee.

THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

DEMAND NO. 14—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—*contd.*

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, with Mr. Rangachariar's permission, I beg to move his motion No. 284, which runs as follows:

"That the provision for Assistants, Clerks, etc., under sub-head 'Department of Education and Health' be reduced by Rs. 100."

I shall confine my remarks solely to one institution in Delhi, and that is the Lady Hardinge Medical College whose finances as admitted by the Honourable the Education Member are in a very unfortunate position. It is a very unique institution and I think the Government should do something to make that institution a successful one and not allow it to die of starvation. It is an institution in which female students alone are allowed to pursue their studies; and when I say that we in Madras have got an exceedingly good institution and that it does not attract even two or three women for the medical degree whereas that even from Madras as many as ten women are studying here for the purpose of taking degrees, it shows how popular this institution is. In this country co-education is not possible to the same extent as in other countries. We can send here our girls to take their degrees in an institution entirely managed by women, in which male students do not study; and that is the reason why this institution is so very successful; I think nothing should be done to make that institution less useful than it is at present, and I am quite sure that the Government have no intention of doing it. I believe there is some difference of opinion as regards the position of this institution owing to the attempt which is being made by the college authorities to have the science department within the institution. The Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University put certain questions to show that it should be affiliated to the University of Delhi. I may say that I have very great sympathy with the functioning of the Delhi University; but I will say this much also that if it comes into conflict with the Medical College I have no doubt what my position would be. I will certainly not allow the Medical College to die out and the Delhi University to gain by the dying of that institution. We must do everything that lies in our power to see that

[Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar.]

this institution is successful, and we want the science class in the Medical College itself, because if it is a science class in the University, male students will also attend it and as I said already female students will not go to a school largely where male students are reading. Under these circumstances it is absolutely desirable that there should be a science department in the Medical College itself and I hope the Honourable the Education Member will see his way to give sufficient funds; as he admitted the other day when I put a number of questions that there is a deficit; this institution should not be allowed to be in that unfortunate position. This institution has also got a hospital which is one of the most popular hospitals that we have in India. They have also an exceedingly good hostel attached to the institution. I am not quite sure whether I have set a good example, because I am particularly anxious that I should not set a bad example. I was almost going to ask you if it is in your province to fix five minutes limit for discussions this day, because there are a large number of subjects to be dealt with which we must get through; and I hope I have not set a bad example for speaking for a long time. I have tried to bring by remarks within the five minutes limit and I shall ask others also to impose this limit upon themselves.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): I do not know whether you have already ruled in anticipation of the request made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, that all speeches shall be retrenched to five minutes, but I hope to curtail my remarks within that compass. I think my friend has entirely misunderstood me if I gave him the impression that I was opposed to the continuance of the Lady Hardinge Medical College for which I have the warmest regard. It is also wrong on the part of my learned friend to assume that we wish in any way to cripple the resources available for the management of that college. What we, on this side of the House desire, Sir, is to make the Honourable the Finance Member a little more charitable to the subject of Education. The Inchcape axe was particularly sharp upon Education and it seems to have got blunted after the Educational grants were cut. The result has been that the subject of Education, Public Health, Sanitation and all the nation-building departments have suffered heavily at the hands of the Inchcape Committee; and it is with that object in view that I put certain questions on the last occasion, but if the Honourable the Finance Member desires to take the sense of this House. I have no doubt that the sense of this House so far as the non-official Members are concerned is strongly and unanimously in favour of making generous grants to educational institutions, Lady Hardinge College as well as the University of Delhi and its constituent Colleges. If he is generously disposed, we have no doubt whatever, Sir, that the Lady Hardinge College will get the grant which it so badly and sorely needs.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): May I just ask, Dr. Gour, Sir, where he hopes to get the money from?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee (Education Member): Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, has made this motion, I take it, to draw the attention of the Government to the needs of Lady Hardinge Medical College. I do not desire to interfere in the internecine warfare between the Democratic Party and what I may describe as the remnants of the Democratic Party. I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri

Ayyar, knows perfectly well that Government have always been extremely sympathetic towards the needs of the Lady Hardinge Medical College. As a matter of fact, even at the present moment, the bulk of the amount needed by that College is furnished by Government, and I am sure that my Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett, will be sympathetic towards any reasonable demand that may be made on behalf of that College. But at the same time I hope that my Honourable friends here will endeavour to raise private donations on behalf of that College. I do not think it is desirable that any institution of this sort should depend entirely on Government support. I shall take this opportunity, Sir, to furnish the information which my friend, Mr. Bangachariar, asked for yesterday with regard to the Medical Research Institute. The position with regard to that Institute was that the Government made an annual grant of Rs. 5 lakhs to the Medical Research Fund Association, and Government have also, altogether, a staff of 25 officers in the Bacteriological or Medical Research department. Of these 25 officers, 9 are employed in provincial institutions and are paid for by the provinces. Three or four of these officers—I do not know exactly which—are attached to the Kasauli Institute which is a Central Institution. The remaining 12 officers—some Indians and some Europeans, some of them I.M.S. officers and some non-I.M.S. officers—are out in the field doing actual research work. Of the Rs. 5 lakhs grant to the Association, about Rs. 2½ lakhs are saved every year in order to make up a capital fund for the building of this institute. The rest of the money is spent on the activities on which these officers are at present engaged. The Government of India have always been extremely anxious to devote money to Medical Research in furtherance of the interests of India as a whole. The question, however, was examined by the Retrenchment Committee, and, as Honourable Members are aware, the Retrenchment Committee have recommended the practical extinction of the department. As my Honourable friend the Finance Member has already said, this is one of the questions which is at present under the consideration of the Government of India, and I am unable to say what the final decision would be. There are two possible courses open, either the course which has been recommended by the Retrenchment Committee or the alternative by which we can retain a skeleton machinery for continuing Medical Research and when finances improve to renew the grants to the Medical Research Association for the building of the Institute. Personally, Sir, I hope that a broader spirit will prevail, but, as I have said, it is impossible to anticipate the decision of the Government of India, and I hope my Honourable friend will be satisfied with the explanation that I have been able to furnish him.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: I do not press my motion, Sir.

Mr. J. P. Cotelingam (Nominated: Indian Christians): Sir, I would like to say a few words on the fate of Education at the hands of the Retrenchment Committee, and the action taken or proposed to be taken by the Government of India on the recommendations made. Honourable Members will see from page 196 of the Report of the Retrenchment Committee that they recommend that the scheme of the University of Delhi be reconsidered, and that the grant to non-Government Arts Colleges and to the Delhi University be reduced. Sir, I would like to say at the outset that while the Members that composed the Committee were expert businessmen and sharp in the use they made of their axe, they did not profess to be experts in matters educational. From the recommendations they have made, they do not seem to have realised that they were to

[Mr. J. P. Cotelingam.]

very large extent counting upon the educational experience of their student days. For example, in the matter of grants, they have proposed the apportionment of grants according to the number of students that attend schools or colleges. That is an exploded theory. We would like to give more attention to quality than to quantity. A school or a college may by lowering its standard attract a very large number of pupils and be able to earn a large amount of grant. In the Madras Presidency some years ago aided schools, especially primary schools, were given what were known as "results grants". On the results produced at inspection or examination, the amount of grant to the various schools was determined. It is a matter for regret that the Retrenchment Committee should give expression to a piece of fallacious reasoning, when in the matter of grants for primary education, they should state that the grants should be fixed on the basis of an average of one teacher per 25 pupils rising to one teacher per 30 pupils. It should be the other way about. Time was when, owing to the paucity of trained teachers in our schools, we were obliged to have a larger number of pupils in a class than an ordinary teacher of ordinary capabilities could manage. We are now looking forward to the time when we shall have trained teachers in all our elementary and secondary schools and have fewer pupils in a class so they can be handled in a satisfactory manner by the teacher. Therefore, instead of fixing the grant at one teacher for 25 pupils, we hope to provide larger grants on the basis of one teacher for less than 25 pupils.

The grants to the three colleges, the constituent colleges of the University of Delhi, are to be reduced. I must state that if the grants are cut down, these three colleges, and especially St. Stephen's College, the foremost of the three, cannot go on. Government has already laid down the policy of education, namely, the allotment of an increasing amount of grant to schools and colleges which continue to be efficient. If the grant is all at once to be cut down on the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee, Sir, I must say that it will amount to a breach of faith. The cutting down of the grant to education, be it to the University or to aided colleges, or to secondary schools is "the most unkindest cut of all". Educational expense in the maintenance and in the strengthening of colleges is bound to increase, and to fix it, as the Retrenchment Committee has recommended, is tantamount to a reduction. The colleges are trying to cope with the situation created by the establishment of the University. They are trying to improve and increase their staff. It will therefore take not less than 10 years or so before they can reach their normal standard of increase and development. If the grant that is now proposed to be cut down on the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee is to be given effect to, I fear these three colleges may soon go out of existence. There are no local bodies that will come to their rescue if Government should reduce or withdraw their grant. And if these three colleges should be weakened by the reduction of the grant as proposed by the Retrenchment Committee, it will mean this, that Government will have to establish a college of their own and maintain it at an exorbitant cost. There is only one other alternative, if the grant to the colleges is reduced. Fees will have to be increased, and if fees have to be increased, fees will also have to be increased in the Punjab. If the standard rate of fees is not raised the Delhi Colleges cannot afford to raise their fees. Depending upon the support that Government will give, the management of St. Stephen's College have obtained large support from their Missionary Society, as also

from the Cambridge Mission, and if Government is to withdraw their grant I am pretty certain that their supporters in Cambridge and in the S. P. G. Society will withhold or reduce their support. Honourable Members know that the staff of the college is very efficient. There are seven Englishmen from the University of Cambridge or other Universities and on their Indian staff professors who are distinguished men of Indian and European Universities. If this support is withdrawn, the staff will soon find other places where their services will be required.

I trust that the appeal made on behalf of the Lady Hardinge College will receive due consideration, and that the grant required for the maintenance of that College will be increased, that the grant already promised to the Delhi University will be continued, and the secondary schools and colleges in Delhi will, instead of having their grants reduced, have them increased in proportion to the work that they are doing and are expected to do. Sir, in the same strain throughout the chapter on education the Retrenchment Committee have proposed reductions. No doubt they recommend that large grants should be given for the support of primary education and they are right there, but when they recommend that, in the interests of economy, grants to secondary schools and colleges be cut down I think they are making a fatal mistake. It would be a suicidal policy to reduce or cut down the grants that are being given to maintain educational institutions. With these few remarks I resume my seat.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: I do not press my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Dr. Nand Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I move:

"That the provision for one Educational Commissioner under the sub-head 'Department of Education and Health' be omitted."

Sir, as you know the Education Department is a nation-building department. Education moulds the character and helps to maintain life, and I think every one of us will have the sincerest sympathy with this Department. I may thus suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member that he will try to see that the Delhi University, which is one of the most desirable Universities, though she is the youngest one, may not suffer in any way. She may be maintained; she may be supported

Mr. President: We have had that discussion. I thought the Honourable Member was going to raise some other subject.

Dr. Nand Lal: I am not referring specifically to that subject; I am going to make a submission before the Finance Member that he may try to protect these institutions. If he wants money, I shall give him cuts from other sources.

Mr. President: We have passed from that point. The money which Government are prepared to give for Education, was discussed on the previous amendment. The House is my witness that no one rose to continue that discussion. It is now closed.

Dr. Nand Lal: Thank you, Sir, I am always in favour of expedition of work. I want that all these colleges in Delhi may be supported and also the schools, that generous contributions may be made to them, and that in any case education here may not suffer in any way. But Sir

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not paying attention to my ruling. He must discuss his motion to reduce the vote for the Educational Commissioner's Department.

Dr. Nand Lal: I have attained the point which I have wanted to achieve.

Now, Sir, while I am in favour of the Educational Department, I am not in favour of any kind of extravagance. Now, when I go into the matter, what do I find? On page 43 under the heading "Educational Commissioner", I find a salary of Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 35,470 allotted for the purposes of this officer. To my mind it does not seem to be at all necessary under the present state of affairs when Education is a transferred subject.

Mr. President: I did not quite appreciate what the Honourable Member was moving. The Educational Commissioner is a non-votable item.

Dr. Nand Lal: The Educational Commissioner is a non-votable item?

Mr. President: Yes.

Mr. R. A. Spence (Bombay : European): It is printed in italics on page 43.

Dr. Nand Lal: My motion is No. 289, and the next one, namely, 290 is also mine.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally (Sind : Muhammadan Rural): May I, Sir, know if the Chair has ruled that all speeches should be confined to five minutes. Dr. Nand Lal has exceeded that time.

Mr. President: In any case the Honourable Member must move something else.

Dr. Nand Lal: May I inform Mr. Hussanally that I am as obedient to the order of the Chair as he is; he should not intervene. I may be permitted to say that I am as amenable to discipline as he is. I am not satisfied, Sir, that this is a non-votable item.

Mr. President: I am quite satisfied that it is.

Dr. Nand Lal: If you say so, Sir, then I must accept it and resume my seat.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move the motion that stands in my name, namely,

"That the provision for Educational Commissioner under the sub-head 'Department of Education and Health' (page 43) be reduced by Rs. 40,000."

Mr. President: That also, I am afraid, is out of order because the entire vote for the Educational Commissioner is Rs. 54,210, of which the votable portion is only Rs. 10,740.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I move this for the purpose of eliciting information. As I have often stated, the total non-votable item might come up to that, but the salary of the Educational Commissioner comes up to Rs. 32,270, which is non-votable; the Curator, Bureau of Education, Rs. 10,140, is votable, and several other items which come up to Rs. 1,14,000. . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member need not repeat this sum. I have already informed him that his motion is out of order in its present form.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Might I modify it and say that the amount be reduced by one rupee. I raise a question of principle and nothing more, and I want information from the Honourable Member in charge of Education. I moved a similar motion last year and I left it to the Department and also for the consideration of the Retrenchment Committee. On page 130 of the Retrenchment Committee's Report they take precisely the same view that we did last year. They say:

"We do not consider that there is any justification for the retention of the Educational Commissioner, the Bureau of Education and the Central Advisory Board, costing about Rs. 1,00,000 or for the retention of the Department as a separate entity."

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: May I interrupt at this stage in the interests of the economy of time. I expect that my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, is raising the question whether these officers ought to be kept on in spite of the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee. I wish to point out to him that my Honourable friend, the Finance Member has already taken credit for a very large sum in order that the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee might be given effect to, so far as possible, and the question of the retention of all these officers and offices is at present under consideration, and I do not think any useful purpose will be served by a discussion at the present moment.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, I do not press my motion but I may offer some suggestions with regard to that. We do not want that the useful work that is being done in this Department should be discontinued, but we only want that economy should be effected. There are, at present, two Departments, one under the Educational Secretary and another under the Educational Commissioner. The Educational Commissioner is a member of the Indian Civil Service and he might be usefully employed elsewhere. (*A Voice:* "He is not.") The work of the Department may be carried on by the Secretary and one Assistant Secretary. The Department collects a lot of information which is useful in the provinces. I do not wish at all that the purpose that this Department serves and the useful work that is being done by it should be discontinued, but I suggest that the two departments should be amalgamated and economy effected, and only a sufficient staff should be retained for the purpose of carrying on the work that belongs to the Central Government. Formerly, this Department looked to Education outside the Central Government, for instance, the Calcutta University, and education all over India. Those are now transferred subjects and the provinces look to their own education. But this Department should exist for this reason that they sometimes require information regarding other provinces and sometimes of the foreign Universities, and I know that the Central Government keeps up-to-date information with regard to the progress of education in other parts of the world. I do not wish that these activities should cease, but my contention is that the Department should only keep a sufficient staff and a minimum staff, through which they can carry on their work; and, as my Honourable friend has said that the matter is receiving consideration, I am prepared to withdraw my motion.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I rise in connection with the point of order that was raised just now. I think there is a certain amount of room for misunderstanding. Dr. Nand Lal's amendment No. 289 was

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

that the provision for one Educational Commissioner be omitted. That would, I submit, be clearly out of order because it is one Educational Commissioner who is non-voted, but the whole of the Rs. 1,14,000 is for the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India, that is the office.

Mr. Chaudhuri's amendment No. 291 is in order or not according as whether Educational Commissioner means the particular item only or the general sub-head.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, I have reduced it to Re. 1. I have taken off Rs. 39,999.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the provision for Educational Commissioner under sub-head 'Department of Education and Health' be reduced by Re. 1."

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it seems to me rather extraordinary that the Government should take advantage of the provision that when you do not require to spend money at all the old item should not be wiped out from their Demand for Grants. The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett sits there without explaining in full and giving satisfaction to my Honourable friend Mr. Chaudhuri as to whether it is necessary at all to keep up the appointment of a member of the Indian Civil Service as Commissioner of Education. Education has become for some time past a transferred subject. We are paying Rs. 5,333, to a Minister per month in almost every province

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: May I rise to a point of order, Sir. May I ask whether Mr. Chaudhuri withdrew his motion or not? I thought, Sir, that he withdrew it.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Neither, Sir, has my Honourable friend, withdrawn it, nor has the leave of the House been granted; and I am perfectly right in asking again for our satisfaction on this question, whether you require the services of an Educational Commissioner at all. If you do not, is it right for you to say that the item is non-votable and therefore you must rule me out. He says "Look here, the Demand and the contents of this budget are non-votable and you cannot move your motions" and here is our President who says it is out of order to vote on the motion. My Honourable friend, Dr. Nand Lal, again, on account of an oversight, or probably his eye-sight being defective did not see the *italics* properly. However that may be, Sir, it is clear that the services of an Educational Commissioner are not necessary, and still Sir, this Government will not do anything. We have always accused the Government of spending money like this, and it seems to me this is the proper time when we may ask for an explanation to satisfy this House that this post of Educational Commissioner, on which we are spending so many thousands of rupees a year is necessary.

Mr. W. M. Hussainally: Sir, on a point of order. Can we discuss this question of the Educational Commissioner, which is a non-voted subject?

Mr. President: As I have already pointed out, the Honourable Member was out of order in attempting to move a reduction which included that particular item; but the question is open for discussion though not for a vote.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): Might I intervene for a moment? As I introduced the general head "General Administration" I should like to recall to the House the fact that it stood in the original demand for grants at Rs. 81,58,000. We propose to deduct from that, owing to the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee, 7½ lakhs. Might I suggest to the House that the real question at issue is whether from that general head we have now made the minimum necessary provision or not? That is really the main point at issue. Have we acted up fully to the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee and the requirements of retrenchment in this matter? If we have, the House should vote supply. As we saw yesterday, there are a large number of separate items, some of them votable, some of them non-votable, on which the House had its observations to make. I would say again that we are prepared to receive the observations of the House as regards the particular items under which we should make that retrenchment of 7½ lakhs to which we are bound. That reduction is in the voted head, but it is always possible for the House, as we know by experience to discuss other items on motions for reduction of establishment. That is to say, taking the case in point, the Educational Commissioner, himself a non-voted item, has an establishment. If the House thinks the retention of the Educational Commissioner to be unnecessary, it is always possible to point this out on a motion to reduce a clerk. So we do not really, by reason of the fact that he is non-voted, keep the question from discussion. But I wish to lay stress on this, that we are making a total retrenchment of 7½ lakhs out of a budget head of 81 lakhs. We are prepared to receive the criticisms of the House in regard to separate items. We do not in any way close a discussion because some of them are voted and others non-voted. But I suggest that the main point is, whether we have sufficiently complied with the requirements of the Retrenchment Committee, in deducting 7½ lakhs from a total of 81 lakhs.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Sir, I am nearly satisfied with the explanation that has been given by the Honourable the Home Member and I see his presence of mind is always ready to tackle a point, but it is not altogether satisfactory with regard to the point on which I wanted an explanation so that this House might have been satisfied that the Government of India, and specially the Finance Department, are not putting a thing which is not accurate.

Mr. President: The question is that the reduction be made.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Harchandral Vishindas (Sind: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, Mr. Kamat himself, being ill, has authorised me to say that as he has been satisfied, probably for the considerations that the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey has just now put before us, that all that he wanted has been done, therefore this amendment* should drop out.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, with your permission I should like to make one suggestion which might have the effect of saving a large amount of discussion, saving the time of the House and enabling it to pass on to other

* "That all votable items under the sub-head 'Educational Commissioner with the Government of India' be omitted."

[Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.]

items. The real question is, as was pointed out by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey, whether the Government have gone far enough to meet the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee. They have made a certain amount of cuts. If instead of indulging in detailed criticism, and making these nibbling proposals to reduce something from this, something from that demand, we move one of those propositions which propose a lump cut under the total demand for General Administration—proposals ranging from a reduction of 5 to 20 lakhs—if some one of these proposals is moved, then we shall have the opportunity of expressing an opinion as to whether the head General Administration can bear an additional cut, and if so, by how much. That, I think will concentrate attention upon the main issue in the case.

I believe, so far as this side of the House is concerned, a very large number are of opinion that the head of General Administration can bear a little more squeezing. I for one should think that it can stand another cut of 5 lakhs. As a matter of fact, the proposals made by the Government fall short of the proposals of the Inchcape Committee by about 13 lakhs. Therefore if we propose an additional cut of 5 lakhs, the requirements of General Administration will not be seriously interfered with and we shall not be paralysing the activities of the departments connected with General Administration. If this suggestion commends itself to my friends here, I hope that one of these propositions at page 24, Nos. 333, 334, 335 or 336 will be moved. I am sorry that Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary is not able to be present this morning, but he was anxious that his proposition, No. 336, should be moved. If my friend, Mr. Samarth, or my friend, Mr. Ginpala, will move

Dr. H. S. Gour: You move it; we will accept it.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: If you will permit me to do so, Sir, I should like to move:

“That the demand under head ‘General Administration’ (page 36), be reduced by Rs. 5 lakhs.”

This is the minimum amount of the cuts proposed under the head General Administration, in these Resolutions of which notice has been given—Resolutions Nos. 333 to 336. Among these proposals No. 336 is most moderate. I think from a practical point of view there is advantage in moving this proposal instead of many of these nibbling Resolutions.

Mr. President: But I have got to protect the rights of the nibblers. I should like to be able to assume with the Honourable Member that those Honourable Members are going to withdraw their motions in favour of his. (Cries of ‘Yes.’)

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: I may mention one point; there are departments with regard to which we want information; we do not want to move reductions by dribblets—that is not what we want, and we will no doubt accept the motion as regards the Rs. 5 lakhs. There are other departments as regards the expenditure on which we want information; we cannot raise such discussion if we are to have a general discussion only on the motion for reduction by Rs. 5 lakhs. These departments will have to be brought under the scrutiny of this House and we shall have to ask questions. We

are quite willing to accept the suggestion made by my Honourable friend that as regards the general reduction there should be a reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs, but some of the departments will have to come under the scrutiny of the House; that cannot be avoided—for example, the Army.

Mr. President: May I take it that that is the general sense of the House that we should have a reduction of say Re. 1 or Rs. 100 on each department on which discussion is desired, and in the end Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer will move a reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs? (Cries of 'Yes.')

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): I rise to a point of order: I wish to talk on one Department in this amendment and I desire to know whether I shall be given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. President: Which department?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: On the Medical Department. Sir, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to ask the Honourable Member in charge of the Civil Medical Department certain information on various subjects. Sir, in my speech on the general discussion of the budget last year, I made certain general observations suggesting certain changes; one of the chief points I raised was that owing to the frequent overlapping, interchanging and dove-tailing of the functions of the Directors of both the Civil and Military Medical Departments, I considered that the appointment of one Director of the Medical Services in India, both civil and military, of course with an adequate staff, would be ample. Sir, from the Detailed Estimates we know what is the cost of the upkeep of the office of Director-General, Indian Medical Service; I am, however, unable to obtain a similar knowledge from the figures supplied to us in the Army Estimates as to the cost of the upkeep of the office of the Director, Medical Services in India, but I think I am right in saying that it stands at a much higher figure than the upkeep of the Director General, Indian Medical Service. We have here, Sir, two Directors with two complete and separate offices controlling one department in India, embracing as they do the medical needs, both civil and military of this country; each one necessitating a lavish expenditure of money. I submit that one Director with an adequate staff would be enough. Here I submit, Sir, is room for great economy in both civil and military Budgets. I regret to notice that in the Retrenchment Committee Report no remarks were made about this point. Certain retrenchments are suggested, such as the abolition of the appointment of Public Health Commissioner and the reduction of the clerical staff of office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service and other matters—making a total retrenchment in this department of something like Rs. 1,10,000. I find it very difficult to avoid referring to the military medical department; I am afraid I must do so. If one refers to the Retrenchment Committee Report on the expenditure of the military medical department it will be noticed that a total cut of over Rs. 50 lakhs is recommended. I consider that the time has come when these two departments or Directorates should be made into one. With such overlapping of functions and with such duplication of labour, I consider it is a waste of money to administer the medical needs of India from these two separate departments; each one costing such a large sum. I therefore put it for the serious consideration of Government as to whether further economies could not be effected on the lines indicated here. This is the first subject to which I wished to refer.

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

The second subject which I wish to refer is one which I am afraid the Honourable Member in charge of this portfolio will say that I am poaching on provincial preserves but I shall risk it because I feel I am treading on safe or already beaten ground. I refer to the Registration of Nurses in India. The various Provincial Councils who have been approached on this matter declare it to be an all-India question which can be dealt with by the Government of India only. Accordingly I approached the Government of India on the same matter and was told by the Honourable Member in charge that it was a purely provincial matter to be dealt with by them and not by the Government of India. I am therefore puzzled by the question of responsibility and I therefore ask for the indulgence of the House while I again refer to this matter. I would ask this House as also the Honourable Member in charge of this department to bear with me whilst I refer to the details in the training of nurses in India. We have in India various medical institutions giving a nurse's training to a large body of ladies, both Indian and of the domiciled community. It seems hardly necessary for me to refer to the very important place a nurse occupies in the treatment of the sick. Here in India we have a noble body of women who are given three or four years' training as nurses, who are allowed to practise their profession in this country, who are given diplomas as fully trained nurses, but who are denied the rights which are to-day possessed and enjoyed by even compounders so far as registration in India is concerned. These nurses are able to earn a livelihood in this country, but if they go to any other country, say England, they are denied recognition as trained nurses and in some cases the practice of their profession, because the Government of India has up to date refused to recognise this body of women by registering them under an Act. It is not so hard for them here, but when they elect to go to any other country they are denied the recognition of their profession and are looked upon as quacks. They are not so much affected now as they will be from July of this year because a recent communication has been received from the Secretary of the General Nursing Council of England and Wales to the effect that those nurses who wish to register under the Nurses Registration Act of England must do so before July this year. Otherwise they will have to subject them-

12 Noon. selves to certain examinations. Now, Sir, I consider this is not fair to the nurses in this country. The only province in India that has so far effected registration is Burma, a province, which my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, complains, is being neglected, but which has led the way to other provinces in this respect and is worthy of emulation. I submit, Sir, that the Government of India must not and cannot shirk their responsibility in this important matter. I am not satisfied, nor are the nurses in India satisfied, with the Provincial Governments shirking and transferring their duties to the Central Government and the Central Government when approached doing likewise to the Provincial Governments. Surely I am not asking too much of the Central Government to give effect to this legislation, *viz.*, "An All-India Nurses Registration Act". The Nurses Association in England refuses to recognise any Provincial Act in India and is prepared to recognise an all-India Act only. Will the Honourable Member in charge of Education inform me if he will be able to introduce an All-India Nursing Registration Act before next July. If he cannot do so by then, will he at least give me an assurance that he will be kind enough to ask the Director General, Indian Medical Service, to write to the Secretary Nursing Association of England and Wales, and assure him

that he will move in the matter and ask that the time limit for Indian trained nurses desirous of registering as such in England be extended to July 1924. I should be grateful if the Honourable Member would do this.

Now, Sir, the next subject I wish to talk on is also a matter which I fear encroaches on the domains of the provinces. It refers to a body of medical men in whom I am naturally very much interested, I mean the Military Assistant Surgeons. I do not mean the Military Assistant Surgeons who are employed in the Army. Their grievances will be discussed by me in a subsequent motion. I refer to those who are employed in the Civil Medical Service in the various provinces.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: May I ask, Sir, if the officers under the Civil Medical Departments in the various provinces come under this head? They are not employed under the Government of India.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member mean in this case they are under the direction and control of the Local Governments?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President: In that case, I think, the Honourable Member is out of order.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I wish to accept your ruling on that matter, Sir. But I beg to differ from the Honourable Member in charge of this portfolio in so far that I am not specifically or exclusively referring to those Military Assistant Surgeons who are civilly employed in the various provinces, and that I am also referring to those Military Assistant Surgeons in civil employ—(I submit, Sir, with all due respect to the Honourable the Education Member),—for whom the Director General, Indian Medical Service, is directly responsible.

Dr. Nand Lal: When you accept the ruling of the Chair, you must accept the assertion of the Honourable the Education Member.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: With all respect to the Chair and to the Honourable Member in charge, I submit, the Director General, Indian Medical Service, is directly responsible for the Indian Medical Department, in fact it is impossible to dissociate him from the working of that department in whatever way the Military Assistant Surgeons are employed, and with your permission, Sir, I wish to push that point if I am in order.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: So far as those officers who are employed directly under the Government of India, I have no objection to the Honourable Member airing their grievances, but I do not think he will be in order to ventilate the grievances of those Military Assistant Surgeons who are employed under Provincial Governments.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I beg to disagree even here with the Honourable Member. I submit, Sir, that since the Military Assistant Surgeons belong to a Department for which the Director General, Indian Medical Service, is directly responsible and since this comes under general discussion to-day I believe I am in order when I referred to those Military

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

Assistant Surgeons who are in civil employ. But, Sir, all that I desire is to obtain from the Honourable Member in charge of this Department an assurance that he will give this matter his sympathetic consideration. We have here the Director of Indian Medical Service as the head of a department which is known as the Indian Medical Department. Those Members who are employed outside the army,—they may be employed by the Central Research Institute or they may be employed in other civil capacities—are under the control of the Director General, Indian Medical Service, and it is in regard to these people that I am speaking. These officers are enlisted in the service from the middle class of the domiciled community. They undergo training for 4 or now for 5 years in well recognised medical institutions and are trained by the same class of professors—Indian Medical Service Officers—who train the Civil Assistant Surgeons. They receive a diploma of equal licensing value to any medical degree in India. If they are not graduates,—I am not going to draw comparisons to their disfavour, because I opine it is not the degree that makes the man but it is the man who makes the degree,—these men are now as good as any of the graduates of the Indian Medical Colleges. Some of these Assistant Surgeons, generally the more brilliant and experienced men, are appointed as Civil Surgeons in various provinces and so have come under Provincial control, Medicine being a transferred subject. Now, Sir, these Assistant Surgeons perform the same duties as do their Civil Assistant Surgeon colleagues who are similarly employed but strange to relate are in some provinces denied the same pay. How often have I not heard Honourable Members in this House declare that if an Indian does the same work as an Englishman he should be given the same pay. I ask this House to apply the same principle to these Military Assistant Surgeons of the domiciled community who are doing the same kind of work as their civil Indian colleagues but who are being given a lower rate of pay. If the Honourable Member in charge of this Department will give me an assurance that he will be kind enough to look into the matter and remedy what is really a crying need, I am sure he will earn the gratitude of the entire department, a department that has done much for India in the past and that is still doing much good for the country.

Sir, the last matter that I wish to talk on is the Senior Women's Medical Service. I believe that, though it is not quite a Government department, it is largely subsidized by Government, and I therefore think it comes within the purview of this general discussion.

Mr. R. A. Spence: May I know what this Senior Women's Medical Service is?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: It is the opposite of the Junior Women's Service. It is really a quasi-official department which is controlled by a lady Chief Medical Officer. This service gets a large grant from Government and also depends for its maintenance on subscriptions from various Indian sources. Sir, my criticisms on this department will not be destructive in character, because the work that is done by this noble body of lady doctors is one that commands my unstinted admiration and praise as also the gratitude of India. But I have a few criticisms to make as to its constitution. Here is a service, Sir, that is entirely financed by Indian subscriptions including one annually from the Government of India. Here is a service, Sir, that is entirely devoted to giving female medical relief in India. Here is a service which I consider *par excellence*

as one which should be recruited entirely in India and not as it is to-day a service for such large employment of English lady doctors recruited in England. I do not wish to decry the splendid services of these English lady doctors; but I do think that the time has arrived when a serious move should be made to recruit this service entirely in India. It is all moonshine to tell me that we have not got the right type of Indian and Anglo-Indian lady doctors in India. The Colleges in India to-day are getting full of Indian and Anglo-Indian domiciled women who have taken to the study of medicine. And I consider that the time has come for the Director of this service to pay greater attention to recruitment for this service in India and to cease recruiting so largely from England. India is quite capable to-day of supplying its own medical needs, both army and civil, both male and female, and I consider that further recruitment in this service should be confined entirely to India and India only.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Sir, the Honourable Member has raised several questions. He has discussed whether there should be one Director for all the Medical Services in India or whether there should be a Director General of the Indian Medical Service and a Director of Medical Services. I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Burdon, would be able to enlighten him on this point, and I will leave it to Mr. Burdon to answer Colonel Gidney in regard to this particular matter. Then, the Honourable gentleman passed on to the question of the abolition of the Public Health Commissioner. That matter is also under the consideration of the Government of India and it is not possible for me to say yet what would be the final decision. The third point which Colonel Gidney has referred to is the question of the registration of nurses. I think I indicated to the Honourable gentleman, in answer to a question some time ago, that this was a provincial transferred question, and really the Government of India could not interfere unless he could bring it within the Devolution Rules as a central subject. If the Honourable gentleman, to whom I shall give every opportunity of doing so, can convince me that this is a central subject, I shall be quite willing to go further into the matter. Then, Sir, he passed on to the question of the pay of Military Assistant Surgeons. So far as I could understand, he was comparing the pay which Military Assistant Surgeons received in the provinces with the pay of Civil Assistant Surgeons in the provinces. That, again, Sir, is a purely provincial subject, and I really do not feel that I am competent to answer on behalf of the provincial Governments. Then, Sir, he has spoken about the Women's Medical Service. This is a service which is controlled by a private Institution, to which it is true Government give certain aids. I shall bring to the notice of that Institution the remarks of my Honourable friend.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, I thank the Honourable Member for what he has just said, and beg to ask that Government will kindly interest themselves and inquire into the matter particularly so far as Assistant Surgeons in the United Provinces are concerned.

Mr. E. Burdon (Army Secretary): Sir, I think my Honourable and gallant friend, Colonel Gidney, raised the question whether it would not be feasible to amalgamate the appointments of Director of Medical Services and Director General of the Indian Medical Service. Well, I should like to explain that this point was, so far as I know, specifically before Lord Inchcape's Retrenchment Committee. It was raised by certain of the questions in the Questionnaire. And it is clear that the Retrenchment Committee found it impossible to pursue the idea of securing an economy by

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

the means which my Honourable friend has indicated. Speaking on behalf of the Army Department, I can say that, from our point of view, it would be quite impracticable to allow the Director, Medical Services, to sacrifice the amount of time which would be required if he were to discharge satisfactorily the duties of Director General of the Indian Medical Service in addition to those which he is already required to carry out. The Director of Medical Services is already very fully employed not only in supervising the Medical Services of the Army but in constructive work and research work which aim at the maintenance of the highest possible standard of health amongst the troops, both British and Indian. There is one other point I should like to suggest to the House, namely, that it would be entirely inappropriate for the Director of Medical Services, primarily a military officer serving under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief, to be concerned with the administration of the Civil Medical Services and with general questions of public health. I think the House will recognise that it would be quite unsuitable for the Director of Medical Services, an officer, as I say, directly under the orders of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, to correspond with Provincial Governments on general questions of that kind.

Finally, the Director of Medical Services has hitherto nearly always been drawn from the Royal Army Medical Corps. I do not say that this arrangement will necessarily hold good for ever. It is possible that we may depart from it and recommendations to that effect, based upon certain proposals made by the Esher Committee, are actually under consideration. At the same time, it is certain that the Director of Medical Services will still from time to time be an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps—an officer who need not necessarily have any knowledge of the problems of India except those which affect troops employed in India, and troops are employed under rather specialised conditions in India. That, I think, is a final and very convincing reason why it would be difficult, if not entirely impracticable, to amalgamate the two appointments which have been mentioned.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I move:

“That the votable portion of the demand under sub-head ‘Finance Department, Pay of officers,’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Sir, I want to invite the attention of the House specially to one point and that point alone has prompted me to offer this amendment. You will be pleased to see on page 130 of the Report of the Indian Retrenchment Committee that the expenditure on the Finance Department in 1913-14 was Rs. 4,10,200; in 1921-22, in the shape of revised estimates, it rose to Rs. 6,74,500; and again it rose in 1922-23, in the form of budget estimates to Rs. 6,91,200. Now, the recommendation which has been made and which is embodied in this Report, is that “this Department has already effected a reduction of Rs. 3,500 to meet the cut made by the Legislative Assembly and of Rs. 57,600 by the abolition of a post of Joint Secretary and by the amalgamation of two branches and by other economies, or in all Rs. 92,600,—allowing for further reductions in the number of peons which it may be possible to make.” Here I pause for a moment and invite the Honourable the Finance Member kindly to give serious consideration to the suggestion which I am going to offer before

this House, that these peons may not be dismissed and that instead of these peons the post of some other officer, whose salary may be sufficient to cover the salaries of a number of these poor clerks and peons, should be abolished. I, with due deference, disagree with this particular recommendation of the learned Committee if it really suggests the dismissal of peons. Had I the time, I would have tried to point out that many thousands of rupees more could be retrenched and I cannot see any reason why these poor peons are going to be victimised. With this brief suggestion, I submit that the Honourable the Finance Member will kindly see his way to save these poor men, namely, the peons.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blckett: Sir, the difficulties of an economist are great. Dr. Nand Lal has objected to the effecting of economy by the dismissal of peons. He suggests that it might be effected in other ways. But I would ask, "What is the purpose for which the House votes Government money to spend upon the Finance Department?" It is that the Finance Department may do a certain amount of work. For that purpose it requires a certain staff and that staff requires a certain number of, among other persons, peons. If the staff which is employed in doing a certain amount of work can do with less peons, is that a matter to which we should object? I do not think it is really necessary very seriously to deal with this proposal. Peons are not dismissed for the amusement of turning them out of work and peons are not employed simply for the purpose of their getting salaries. They are employed if they are needed and they are not employed if they are not needed. Surely the only criterion that we should use there is, what is the minimum number with which we can get through a certain amount of work.

Mr. K. Ahmed: I do not think, Sir, this question has been sufficiently understood. The amendment is:

"That the votable portion of the demand under sub-head 'Finance Department, Pay of Officers,' be reduced by Rs. 100."

I find they are, Sir, on page 44 all in *italics*. We cannot touch them because they are untouchable. It is not the sense of this House to take away their peons but to seal them with the robe of red-tapeism. The question is: not whether Rs. 100 is not actually Rs. 99 plus Re. 1 but it is the expression of this House that they disapprove of the intelligence that has been applied hitherto as far as the Finance Department is concerned and therefore Rs. 100 is to be taken away from the officers' pay—not of untouchables but of touchables. They have got some officers in their office that can be touched. If Rs. 100 is taken away from their salary just to show our disapproval of the action of the intelligent members of untouchables, they will be more intelligent and will try their utmost to realise the situation as they thought they would be more independent without peons. I suppose then our purpose will be served, and that is why, Sir, we want that Rs. 100 should be reduced.

Mr. President: The question is that that reduction* be made.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. B. N. Misra (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): I think the Honourable Sir Sivaswami Aiyar is going to move a general reduction. I shall speak on that reduction.

* "That the votable portion of the demand under sub-head Finance Department, Pay of Officers (page 44) be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): May I move my small amendment of reduction of Re. 1 in the Industries Department, of which I said yesterday that I had put in the word "Home" for "Industries" by mistake? It is No. 267. In moving my motion,* Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House to one of the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee. It is given on page 132. The Inchcape Committee say as follows regarding the Labour Bureau:

"We consider that the work done by the Industrial Intelligence Section and the Labour Bureau could be discontinued without serious inconvenience. It is represented that a certain amount of labour and other legislation is pending in the immediate future, but this could, in our opinion, be more appropriately arranged for by placing an officer temporarily on special duty than by making permanent additions to the establishment."

Thus, Sir, the Retrenchment Committee suggest to the Government of India to abolish the Labour Bureau of the Government of India. Sir, the Retrenchment Committee consisted of eminent men but that Committee had one defect, namely, it consisted mostly of business people and as business people

Mr. R. A. Spence: Is that a defect?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: . . . there was not much love lost between themselves and labour as well as between themselves and the Department of Government which concerns itself with labour. Therefore, the suggestion that they have made is natural. But at the same time the House must remember that it does not consist mostly of business people and it ought not to consist mostly of business people. The House represents the country and as such the House has also a duty to represent labour interests. Sir, at present the Government of India is not spending a large sum of money on its Labour Bureau. There are only two large appointments that I see here, a Controller of Labour whose salary is Rs. 1,500 and an Adviser to the Labour Bureau on a much smaller salary. Sir, the gentleman who occupies the post of Controller of Labour Bureau is known to this House. The House knows very well my friend Mr. Clow. They have seen his ability and I can assure the House that his sympathies for the interests of labour are also as well known. Sir, it is mistake that the Government of India should think of abolishing this office if they are thinking of doing so. But I would like the House to express its opinion against its abolition if Government thinks of abolishing that office. Questions regarding labour will arise every now and then. You are not going to get rid of the labour problem, especially so as the House wants the country to develop industrially very fast. If the country develops very fast industrially the industrial development will bring in its train certain evils which you cannot avoid and which the world has not avoided. Therefore, it will be a great mistake if the Government of India ever think of abolishing its Labour Bureau. It is absolutely necessary that the conditions of life and work of labour should be studied by the Government of India.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): And the people.

* "That the provision for Pay of establishment under sub-head Industries Department be reduced by Re. 1."

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, there is another appointment in that Bureau—the Adviser to Labour Bureau. Unfortunately I do not see any amount placed against that head in this year's Budget. I do not know whether the Government of India even before the Retrenchment Committee was appointed, have decided to abolish that post, and if the Government of India have done it, it is a great pity and I want the House to tell the Government of India that they have made a great mistake in abolishing that post. Sir, that post was held by a lady, Miss Broughton, whose sympathies towards labour were also very great. She had done very valuable work in studying the conditions of life and work of the women workers in India, and, Sir, I was hoping that the Government of India would very soon undertake legislation prohibiting the employment of women and providing benefits for women working in factories. As a matter of fact I have given notice of a Resolution to that effect, but unfortunately if the Government of India decide to abolish that post, there is hardly much hope for me. I therefore feel that even if the Government had decided to abolish that post they will reconsider that decision and restore that post. It is absolutely necessary that the country should not neglect the labour problem. If they neglect it to-day I think the country will have to be sorry afterwards. I therefore move my amendment that the amount for the Industries Department be reduced by Re. 1.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): While I have my differences with Mr. Joshi on many points I am glad to say that on this occasion I endorse every word that he has said with regard to the Labour Bureau. It is already in the air, perhaps encouraged by the reports appearing in irresponsible newspapers, that this House as it does not consist properly of representatives of labour does not do justice to the requirements of the labour population. I do not for a moment admit that we are guilty in that direction. I hold that this House in spite of the fact that we have no direct labour representation in the Assembly itself has gone a great way to legislate for the benefit of the labour in this country. But I do hold that the step that we are about to take if we were to recommend to Government that the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee in this direction should be accepted—that step will land us in considerable difficulties with labour. We shall be rightly misunderstood by the labour population of this country. We shall be rightly told that we neglect the demand that labour has on us for considering its requirements in this country. I hold that there is no reason whatsoever to do away with this Department which has shown that it is capable of doing excellent work. All of us who had the occasion to hear Mr. Clow and to know something of his work connected with the Labour Bureau will bear testimony to the usefulness of his contribution to the work of the Industries Department. We are keen and rightly keen on seeing this country placed on the path of rapid industrial development, but we should be making a mistake if we blinded ourselves to the evils that will inevitably accompany the rapid industrial development of this country. Therefore, a Bureau like the Labour Bureau is extremely necessary for enabling us to minimise those evils, to avoid the mistakes which have been made in other parts of the world and to avoid the dangers which have accompanied industrial development in other countries. I hope therefore that the Government will not in this respect countenance the recommendation made by the Inchoape Committee but will continue to allow the Labour Bureau to carry on its useful activities.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I make a suggestion? I fail to see why this Labour Bureau should not be amalgamated with the Central Bureau of Information. (Laughter). I see some Honourable Member laughing at it, but I do think that there is a lot in co-ordination. Instead of each Department having its own Bureau I think that if we have a Central Bureau of Information in which all Departments can come together it will conduce to economy and it will conduce to speedy disposal of work. I do think that instead of abolishing the Labour Bureau steps should be taken to amalgamate it with the Central Bureau of Information.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes (Commerce and Industries Member): I do not think that Mr. Rangachariar has quite appreciated the work which the Labour Bureau does. The Labour Bureau exists for the purpose of collecting, collating and studying information regarding labour questions throughout India. We collect information regarding such matters as strikes, the reasons for strikes, how they were dealt with, the working of the Factory Act and so on. This information is continuously being collected and is continuously being studied and I think that every one in this House will recognise that in these latter days it is very necessary that the process should be carried on. I am, however, in a difficulty in dealing with Mr. Joshi's motion, for as the House knows, the whole of the future of the Departments of the Government of India and of the staff to be attached to the Departments as reorganised is now under consideration. All I can say at the present moment is that we realise the importance of the issues raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi and that we will take those issues into very serious consideration when we finally rearrange these Departments.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Statutory authority for maintenance of Standing Army.

• **Mr. P. P. Ginwala** (Burma: Non-European): I move:

“That the demand under sub-head ‘Army Department’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

I may remind the House that last year a similar reduction was moved and carried by the House by a very large majority in which you will find that practically every non-official, European or Indian, Member of this House with the exception of three Indian non-official Members voted in favour of the motion for reduction. That motion was carried mainly on two grounds, first of all, on the ground of excessive military expenditure. I believe my Honourable friend Sir Montagu Webb made a very powerful speech condemning the extravagance of the military expenditure on that occasion. The other ground was that this House was unwilling to vote any money to the Government unless the military expenditure was made votable. Since then the position has developed a bit against the Government if I may so put it, though these two complaints still remain to a very large extent. Last September I put a question to the Army Department as to what statutory authority existed for the maintenance of an army in India in times of peace. A reply was given to me on the 15th January this year to that question in which it was stated that there were certain statutes upon which they relied. I am satisfied that by a *bona fide* mistake they had forgotten to mention that all those statutes had been repealed. I repeated the question on a subsequent date and I got a definite reply from the Government that there was no

statutory authority for the maintenance of an army in India. Questioned further as to what other authority they had, they said they depended upon the inherent powers of the Crown for the maintenance of an army. I venture to submit to this House that this is not an academic question as some Honourable Members may seem to think. It is a very serious question to my mind. This inherent power of the Crown so far as the constitutional law of England is concerned is for practical purposes a myth. If anybody tried to suggest in Great Britain that under the inherent power of the Crown it was possible for the Crown to maintain an army, he would run the risk of being beheaded. The Crown had that power at one time but that power has been taken away long since and for two hundred years or more at any rate in England this inherent power of the Crown has never been exercised for the maintenance of an Army. But the argument may be advanced by the Government, as no doubt it will be advanced, that in England by statutory enactments that power has been curtailed but that the Crown may still exercise the power outside Great Britain. I deny that there is any such authority for that proposition. I see the Honourable the Law Member has got some books on constitutional law from which he will no doubt read later on but I do not think I shall trouble the House with reading any authority on that subject. I shall be satisfied if the Honourable the Law Member is able to convince the House that in any Colony the Crown has attempted to maintain a Standing Army at the expense of the colony,—which is the point—under the inherent powers of the Crown. There would have been a revolt in the Colonies if the Crown had attempted to do that. The Crown may have maintained in the past an Army under the legal authority of an Act of Parliament in the colonies for garrisoning the Colonies but it was Parliament who voted the money. They never attempted at any time to maintain a Standing Army in any of the Colonies for which the Colonies themselves paid. If the Honourable the Law Member attempts to meet this objection he must bear these two things in mind, that the Crown maintained an Army under this inherent power in the Colonies and that the Colonies were made to pay for the Army. Now even looking at the past history of legislation in this country, you would find that the Crown never attempted to do that even in India. The Army was maintained under an Act of Parliament by the Crown in India so far at any rate as the East India Company was concerned and so far as that army was transferred by the East India Company to the Crown and an express provision had to be made in the Government of India Act, 1858, creating a charge upon the revenues of India in respect of the Army that was then transferred. But even if that did apply, apart from the fact that that has been repealed only to the extent to which the army could be maintained by the East India Company, it will not apply to any extension of the Army or increase in the strength of the Army. Anyhow that provision has been repealed. The Government of India Act, 1858, especially the provisions of that Act relating to this have been expressly repealed and in fact the Government have admitted that there is no statutory authority. So I do not think it is necessary for me to labour that point.

Now, I maintain, Sir, that the Government of India does not do itself any credit by maintaining an army in this fashion. It helps itself to the revenues of India by making military expenditure non-votable but it goes further. It establishes an army wholly without any legal authority. It is an illegal position, and it will be much truer to call this despotism, which

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

is sometimes described as a benevolent despotism, a military despotism from the constitutional point of view. I do not mean it in any other sense. When they have got no authority to maintain the Army, they do maintain an Army and they turn to the revenues of India for the purpose of paying an Army illegally maintained by them. Now, take the logical consequence of this maintenance of the Army in India with regard to the constitution of England itself. It simply means this that the Crown can maintain a very large Army in India, if it chose, which it can employ anywhere else, even against the British people themselves. It is repugnant to British notions altogether that the Crown should have either direct or indirect power to maintain a Standing Army without the express authority of Parliament. I am not raising any technical objections whatsoever, I may assure the House. But what I suggest to the Government of India is this, that instead of taking their stand on such shadowy right as the inherent power of the Crown, it would be doing the right thing not only from its point of view, but of every element in and outside this House if it took steps to regularise this position. It can do it in two different ways. Last year we claimed that it was in the discretion of the Governor General to treat military expenditure as votable, if he liked. The Government were advised by their Law Officers to the contrary and we see what good use they have made of that advice. Many items which were formerly votable have now become non-votable . . .

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: And *vice versa*.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: True, Sir, but the process has begun and I do not know where it will stop. I do not say that what they are doing is illegal. But I would point out to the House that there is a very serious risk of the scope of non-votable items being extended, if we do not safeguard ourselves. Secondly, they have got the usual method which they have in their own country to have a statute passed by this Assembly every year authorising them to maintain the Army at a particular strength; that would legalise the whole situation. I am willing to believe they will not easily adopt that course, because they unnecessarily suppose that we shall not be willing to allow them to maintain the Army at the strength at which they wish to maintain it. The sooner they disabuse themselves of this, the better it would be for their relations with this House. What we want them to do is to lay their cards on the table properly, and I have no hesitation in saying that this House would do everything that they reasonably require for the maintenance of an Army for the defence of India. I do not wish to take too much of the time of the House by dwelling too long on the constitutional aspect of the question. I will put it to the Government merely from the practical point of view. They will not be able to convince anybody, even if the Law Member cited hundred authorities, that such a thing as the inherent power of the Crown exists. The man in the street will not be able to follow that at all, and it is his money that you are spending. You have got to satisfy him that what you are doing is legal, that it is right and that it is based on some authority. You may cite, as I say, hundreds of books, but that will not carry the slightest conviction. What would convince the people of this country of your *bona fides* in this respect is to come boldly to this House every year asking for an Army Act or to make the Military expenditure votable. Sir, I move my amendment.

Mr. President: Amendment moved:

“That the demand under sub-head ‘Army Department’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

If I allow the Honourable Member to move and the debate subsequently to proceed on the lines of the constitutional argument which he has presented, I think I should add that I do not want thereby a precedent to be created. On the whole I think it would have been better to raise a large issue like this on the motion that the Finance Bill be considered rather than on the Army vote, but as it is technically in order, I have accepted it, though with that warning.

Sir Montagu Webb (Bombay: European): Sir, I spoke last year in support of Mr. Ginwala's motion to reduce the Army expenditure, which I considered was a danger, and a grave danger to the finances of this country

Mr. President: Is the Honourable Member going to discuss the issue raised?

Sir Montagu Webb: No, Sir.

Mr. President: Then for the purposes of orderly debate, I think we will exhaust that first.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, I do not intend to emulate my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, in questioning the constitution or the right of the Government to maintain an Army in India. I desire to confine my remarks to the military medical department of the Army.

Mr. President: Perhaps the Honourable Member did not hear what I said to Sir Montagu Webb. I think we had better exhaust the subject raised by Mr. Ginwala's speech, and if other Honourable Members do not wish to speak on that now I shall call upon the Law Member.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir I wish to contribute a few words to the constitutional question raised by the Honourable Mover of this amendment. Honourable Members will know that under constitutional law the Sovereign was at one time ideally the centre of all power, but as the constitution developed, sovereignty became divisible and sovereign rights were gradually transferred to the people. That is the genesis of the British Parliament. The sovereign rights have been practically all transferred to the British Parliament. Therefore though the King of England, remains the fountain head of honour and perhaps of mercy, all the constitutional power of the King of England is transferred to and vested in the British Parliament. That is also the position as regards the Colonies. The sovereign power has been transferred by the various Acts constituting the constitutional Acts of the various Dominions. In India up to the passing of the Reforms Act we had the semblance of a constitution, but even that constitution had laid down a very salutary principle, now embodied in section 21 of the Government of India Act. It laid down that:

“Subject to the provisions of this Act and rules made thereunder the expenditure of the revenues of India both in British India and elsewhere shall be subject to the control of the Secretary of State in Council, and no grant or appropriation of any part of those revenues or of any other property coming into the possession of the Secretary of State in Council by virtue of the Government of India Act shall be made without the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India.”

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

All the revenues of India are therefore directly under the control of the Secretary of State and no grant or appropriation of those revenues can be made except in the manner and to the extent provided by this Statute. The question therefore arises, are the revenues of India for the maintenance of the Army in this country diverted in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Government of India Act? That, I submit, is the short question. When Mr. Ginwala interpellated the Government, the position of the Government was that the Army in India is maintained under the inherent power of the Crown, and that there is nothing in the Government of India Act to prevent the revenues of India being utilised for the purpose of maintaining such an Army. The latter argument is met by reference to section 21 of the Government of India Act to which I have adverted. There remains the question about the inherent power of the Crown. I have already submitted to Honourable Members that the moment the sovereignty becomes merged into a Parliamentary Statute and a constitution is granted to a colony or to a country, *pro tanto* the inherent powers of the Crown are affected and modified and, so far as the Statute now known as the Government of India Act lays down a certain mode and manner in which the revenues of India shall be applied, the powers of the Crown are limited; otherwise, there would be a repugnancy between the constitution granted by Parliament and the inherent rights of sovereignty, and I therefore submit that it is not right to claim that the Army in India is maintained under the inherent power of the Crown. The position, therefore, is reduced to this. We have to pay the major portion of our revenues for the maintenance of the Army in India. There is no statutory authority for the payment of the Army in this country; the inherent power of the Crown cannot be invoked in support of its maintenance; the position, therefore, is that constitutionally this expenditure is being incurred upon a purpose not justifiable by law. What is then the remedy? The obvious remedy suggested by Mr. Ginwala is that there should be an Annual Army Act enacted in this country as it is enacted in England, which provides for the maintenance and pay of the Army in the United Kingdom. That Annual Army Act is subject to the annual vote of the House of Commons, and, if a similar Army Act is enacted in this country, it must be brought to this House and be subject to its vote.

The other position raised by my friend, Mr. Ginwala, is, with all deference to him, untenable. He said that the other alternative open to the Government was to make Army expenditure votable and thereby circumvent the legal difficulty which he has enunciated; but I do not see, Sir, how by transferring the Army vote from the non-voted to the voted portion of the Budget, the legal objection would be surmounted. I therefore submit that the Government should, in order to legalise the Army in India, take legislative measures and bring an enactment annually for the acceptance of this House. That seems to be the constitutional position.

I understand, Sir, that the question as regards the excessive military burden from which this country suffers is not to be discussed at this juncture, and, therefore, what I have to say on that question I shall say later on.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: Is there anything forbidding military expenditure?

Dr. H. S. Gour: The Honourable Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer has asked me a question and I

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.

The Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi (Law Member): Sir,
 1 P.M. on the motion now before the House my Honourable and learned friend Mr. Ginwala has raised the question of authority for the maintenance of a Standing Army in India. I have no doubt that my Honourable friend has thought it necessary to raise this question again at this stage by reason of the answer which was given to him at a previous meeting of this Assembly, according to which answer there was no statutory authority in the Government of India Act for the maintenance of such an Army, and the inherent power of the Crown was invoked in support of such maintenance. I am prepared to admit that the answer then given to my Honourable friend was not quite correct.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (and others). Who gave that answer?

The Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: There is statutory power in the Government of India Act itself for the maintenance of a Standing Army in India, and I now proceed to make that position clear. If Honourable Members will turn to section 1 of the Government of India Act, they will find that this is what the section enacts:

“The territories for the time being vested in His Majesty in India are governed by and in the name of His Majesty the King Emperor of India and all rights which, if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, might have been exercised by the East India Company in relation to any territory, may be exercised by and in the name of His Majesty as rights incidental to the Government of India.”

Now, Honourable Members will notice that according to the express enactment embodied in this section, all rights possessed by the East India Company prior to the enactment of the 1858 Act, referred to in this section, may now be exercised by the Crown or the Government of India. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, has himself admitted to-day that the East India Company had authority to maintain an Army in India, and he pointed out that the authority empowering the East India Company to maintain an Army was derived from an Act of Parliament. I see my Honourable and learned friend Mr. Rangachariar shake his head. Let me invite his attention to what is known as the Indian Mutiny Act, George II Chapter IX “An Act to punish mutiny and desertion of officers and soldiers in the service of the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies.” The language of that enactment is somewhat of the old type; but my Honourable friend will find that Parliament in this enactment recognised the right of the East India Company to maintain an Army in this country

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Conferred it.

The Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: —*Recognised*, I said—and went on to make provisions for courts-martial and other matters—expressly recognised, there was no question of conferment—recognised the right of the East India Company to maintain an Army in India. As a matter of fact prior to the enactment of this statute, the East India Company actually did maintain an army in India; this Act recognised the right of the East India Company to do so and went on to make provisions for the administration of military affairs and of the army in this country. That right of the East India Company was again recognised in the Act of 1833; and in 1858 when the administration of the affairs of this country was taken over by the Crown from the East India Company, you will find that in the Act of 1858 provisions were expressly embodied for the

[Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

transfer to the Crown not only of the civil but also of the military administration. (*Mr. N. M. Samarth*: "Existing establishments.") It was unnecessary at that time to make the provision embodied in those sections because the administration of India was being transferred from the East India Company to the Crown . . .

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: What happened to the inherent power of the Crown in 1858?

The Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: Let me make the position clear. There was no question at that time of the inherent power of the Crown, and so far as this part of my argument is concerned, there is for my purpose no question of the inherent power of the Crown now. I am not dealing with the extent of the inherent power of the Crown in this part of my argument. What I am emphasising is this, that Parliament, having by a statute recognised the right of the East India Company to maintain an army in India and having subsequently in the Act of 1833 repeated the recognition of that right, when the administration of the affairs of this country, civil and military, were taken over, or in other words were transferred from the East India Company to the Crown, in 1858, it became necessary to make those specific provisions for the transfer to the Crown not only of the civil but also of the military administration of the country from the East India Company. But the military administration of the country, having once been transferred under that statute to the Crown and having become vested in the Crown from that date onwards, there was no necessity to repeat these sections now in the Act of 1919. All that was necessary to lay down and to embody was that the rights which the East India Company possessed before the enactment of the statute of 1858 should now be exercisable by the Crown. Section 1 of the Government of India Act clearly lays that down and all rights exercisable by the East India Company before the transfer of the administration from the hands of the East India Company to the Crown can now be exercised by the Crown. The words are "and all rights which if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, might have been exercised by the East India Company in relation to any territories may be exercised by and in the name of His Majesty as rights incidental to the Government of India." It is clear, therefore, that there is a statutory power—no question of the inherent right of the Crown—a statutory power conferred upon His Majesty to exercise all rights which were exercisable by the East India Company in respect of any territories, and those rights can be exercised now.

Now, I ask the Honourable Members to turn their attention for a moment to section 20 of the Act, sub-section (1). According to this sub-section, "the revenues of India shall be received for and in the name of His Majesty and shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be applied for the purposes of the government"—not with a capital G but with a small g,—of India." Now defence of India against foreign invasion or against an insurrection in the country is part and parcel of the duties connected with the Government of India and is one of the duties cast upon Government. It is clear, therefore, that under section 20, the revenues of India may be applied for maintaining an army for the defence of India and also for putting down any rebellion that may occur in the country itself, for armies cannot be improvised in a day. It is indeed obvious that one of the essential duties which the Government has to

perform is to be prepared to defend the country against foreign invasion, and that cannot be done unless Government maintains an army. And if you compare the language of this sub-section with the language embodied in section 22 of the Government of India Act, the point will become still more clear. This is how section 22 runs:

“Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty’s Indian possessions or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defraying the expenses of any military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of those possessions by His Majesty’s forces, be charged upon those revenues.”

A careful examination of section 22 makes it perfectly clear to any reasonable mind that this section embodies a prohibition that the revenues of India shall not be spent upon any military expedition beyond the frontiers of India unless that military expedition is rendered necessary for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty’s Indian possessions. It follows, therefore, I submit necessarily, that the revenues of India may be spent upon any military expedition necessitated for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty’s Indian possessions and that these revenues may be spent upon military forces maintained for that purpose. It is clear, therefore, that section 22 justifies the maintenance of a Standing Army in India in order to prevent or repel actual invasion of His Majesty’s Indian possessions and that the revenues of India may legitimately be spent on the maintenance of such army.

Again, Sir, it is because that is the position laid down in this Statute that certain other provisions have been enacted in the Government of India Act. Let me invite the attention of the House to section 36, clause 4. According to section 36, clause (4) (this section refers to the constitution of the Executive Council):

“If any Member of the Council (other than the Commander-in-Chief for the time being of His Majesty’s forces in India) is at the time of his appointment in the military service of the Crown, he shall not, during his continuance in office as such member, hold any military command or be employed in actual military duties.”

Then, according to section 37:

“If the Commander-in-Chief for the time being of His Majesty’s forces in India is a Member of the Governor General’s Executive Council, he shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, have rank and precedence in the Council next after the Governor General.”

It will be clear from these provisions that, because there is statutory authority, as I have contended, for the maintenance of an Army in India, it is therefore necessary to have a Commander-in-Chief of that Army in this country and the Commander-in-Chief occupies as a member of the Government of India a certain position in the Executive Council which is described in section 36. If, among the Members of the Executive Council there should be one who holds a military position in the Army in India, maintained under the statutory authority referred to, then he will not, while he is a Member of the Executive Council, hold any command in the Army itself. Again, when we turn to section 44, what do we find? This is what that section contains:

“The Governor General in Council may not, without the express order of the Secretary of State in Council, in any case (except where hostilities have been actually commenced, or preparations for the commencement of hostilities have been actually made against the British Government in India or against any prince or state dependent thereon, or against any prince or state whose territories His Majesty is bound by any subsisting treaty to defend or guarantee), either declare war or commence hostilities or enter into any treaty for making war against any prince or state in India, or enter into any treaty for guaranteeing the possessions of any such prince or state.”

[Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

Now, this section again clearly contemplates the maintenance of an Army, the expenditure on which, as I have already observed, is a charge on the revenues of India, because otherwise this particular section would be entirely meaningless. Declaration of War in certain circumstances by the Governor General in Council presupposes the existence of an Army which he will make use of immediately on a Declaration of War and the whole scheme of the various provisions embodied in the Government of India Act, cognate to the matter with which we are now dealing, clearly indicates the correctness of the contention which I have submitted to the House, based on section 1 of the Government of India Act, that is to say, the authority of the Crown to maintain an Army in India and the revenues of India being chargeable for the expenses of that Army is well established by statute, otherwise all these various provisions to which I have invited attention would be meaningless.

Then, if you turn to section 65 (1) (d), the Indian Legislature has power to make laws:

"for the Government officers, *soldiers (airmen) and followers in His Majesty's Indian forces*, wherever they are serving, in so far as they are not subject to the Army Act (or the Air Force Act)."

That provision again clearly shows the existence of an Army in India and the power of the Indian Legislature to enact laws for certain purposes which govern the soldiers employed in that Army. Again, according to section 67 (2) (c):

"It shall not be lawful, without the previous sanction of the Governor General, to introduce at any meeting of either Chamber of the Indian Legislature any measure affecting—

* * * * *

(c) the discipline or maintenance of any part of His Majesty's military, naval or air forces",

thus excluding the jurisdiction of this House and of the other House in connection with certain matters connected with the military forces in this country.

Then we come to section 95. This is what that section enacts:

"The Secretary of State in Council, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, may make rules for distributing between the several authorities in India the power of making appointments to and promotions in military offices under the Crown in India, and may reinstate military officers and servants suspended or removed by any of those authorities."

Here again, the House will notice that this particular provision in the Act contemplates the maintenance of an army in India and the appointment as officers of that army by any authority to whom such power of appointment may be delegated by the Secretary of State in Council.

Again in section 96-A:

"Notwithstanding anything in any other enactment, the Governor General in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, may, by notification, declare that, subject to any conditions or restrictions prescribed in the notification, any named ruler or subject of any state in India shall be eligible for appointment to any civil or military office under the Crown to which a native of British India may be appointed."

and so on. Provision is thus made for appointment not only of British subjects but even of Rulers of Indian States or of subjects of Indian States to military appointments in India.

The whole scheme of the Act, therefore, clearly shows that the right to maintain an army in India just as it existed in the days of the old East India Company, is recognised by section 1 of the Government of India Act and that right is vested in His Majesty the King Emperor. The revenues of India may be properly made use of according to section 20 in the maintenance of that army, various provisions are made showing that a Commander-in-Chief for the Indian forces and various other officers for the Indian army may be appointed in this manner and that the Indian Legislature is empowered to pass certain laws to which even soldiers of His Majesty's Army in India will be subject, express provision is made excluding certain matters from the jurisdiction of the Indian Legislature and other cognate provisions have been enacted in this Statute clearly providing for matters connected therewith. It is clear, therefore, from a perusal of the various provisions embodied in this Act relating to the administration of military affairs in this country that there is ample statutory authority for the maintenance of an army in this country, and also for expenditure out of the Indian revenues for the maintenance of that army.

In conclusion, there is one observation, Sir, which I have to make upon the general principle to which Mr. Ginwala and more particularly my Honourable friend Dr. Gour referred. Dr. Gour pointed out that in the first instance all authority is vested in the King Emperor. "The King Emperor is the centre of all authority" was the expression I think that Dr. Gour used. But he pointed out that in England by reason of certain enactments the authority with regard to the maintenance of an army had been transferred from the Crown to the Parliament. That is exactly the position. In England prior to the enactment of the particular statute which was in the mind of my Honourable friend—the Bill of Rights—the Crown had full power to maintain an army in the Kingdom of Great Britain. It was the Bill of Rights which took away that power from the Crown. The Bill of Rights applies only to the Kingdom of Great Britain, for at the time it was passed India was not part of that Kingdom at all. This is perfectly clear—my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala shakes his head—it is perfectly clear even from the latest Army and Air Force (Annual) Act. (Mr. Ginwala: "May I say the Annual Army Act provision is entirely different from the Bill of Rights.") If you will turn to the Preamble of the Army and Air Force (Annual) Act, 1922, you will find:

"And whereas it is adjudged necessary by His Majesty and this present Parliament that a body of land forces should be continued for the safety of the United Kingdom and the defence of the possessions of His Majesty's Crown and that the whole number of such forces should consist of two hundred and fifteen thousand, including those to be employed at the depôts in the United Kingdom for the training of recruits for service at home and abroad, *but exclusive of the numbers actually serving within His Majesty's Indian possessions.*"

It is clear from the last words of this paragraph of the Preamble which I have just read that His Majesty's Forces in India are excluded from the application of the Statute. Well, what I was going to emphasize is this: In every country when constitutional development takes place from autocracy towards democracy all power is at the earlier stage vested in the Crown. Gradually as constitutional development takes place, by various enactments powers are transferred from the Crown to the democratic

[Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

Government that may be introduced in the country. It is not until the stage of full responsible Government is reached, when the administration vests in the hands of a Parliament, that the Crown is deprived of the power possessed by it to maintain an army. When that stage is reached in India and an express provision is then enacted that no forces will be maintained unless with the sanction of the Indian Parliament, then and then alone the power of the Crown to maintain an army in India will disappear and that power will be transferred to the Indian Parliament of the future. Until that stage is reached the power vests in the Crown apart even from any statutory authority and I submit that the reply given at the previous stage—the latter half of the reply that was given at the previous stage—was really correct and that it was fully justified on principle. I submit to the House that there is ample statutory authority for the maintenance of an army in India and for the expenses of that army being charged on the revenues of India and also that even upon general principles the position taken up by my Honourable friend is unsound.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: After the elaborate speech of the Honourable the Law Member, it is hardly necessary for me to intervene in this debate. If I enter the lists at all, it is rather the temptation offered by an abstract legal discussion to a quondam lawyer. Let me congratulate my friend Dr. Gour on the discovery he has made, I am afraid, I must say, of a mare's nest. The point that he has taken may, I think, be much more shortly disposed of than it has been by the Honourable the Law Member. The Honourable Dr. Gour has asked for the statutory authority under which the army in India is maintained.

(At this stage Mr. Deputy President took the Chair.)

May I ask him what authority there is in the Statute for maintaining a Police department, for maintaining an Education Department, for maintaining any of the numerous other Departments which are essential to the administration of any civilised Government?

Dr. H. S. Gour: The various Acts of the Indian Legislature.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: Now, Sir, my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, referred to section 20 of the Statute. Now section 20 lays down this:

"There shall be charged on the revenues of India alone (a) all the debts of the East India Company, (b) all sums of money, costs, charges and expenses which if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed would have been payable by the East India Company"

Dr. H. S. Gour: I rise to a point of order. My Honourable friend has entirely misunderstood me. I did not refer to section 20 but to section 21.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: I am coming to that. It is necessary for my purpose to refer to section 20;

"... and (c) all expenses, debts and liabilities lawfully contracted and incurred on account of the Government of India."

Does it mean under a specific provision of law or statute or does it mean all those expenses which it is lawful for the Government to incur in the absence of any prohibition of that expenditure? I take it that the plain and commonsense interpretation which should be placed upon this clause

is simply this. That whatever expense may be lawfully contracted, that is without infringing any law, on account of the Government of India may be paid out of the revenues of the Government of India. The Government of India carries on numerous functions and the expenditure which it has to incur on account of these various functions come under this head, expenses lawfully incurred on account of the Government of India. Now, come to section 21 upon which my learned friend places some reliance :

“ Subject to the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder, the expenditure of the revenues of India, both in British India and elsewhere, shall be subject to the control of the Secretary of State in Council and no grant or appropriation of any part of those revenues or of any other property coming into the possession of the Secretary of State in Council by virtue of the Government of India Act, 1858, or this Act shall be made without the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India.”

That provides for the control of the Secretary of State, though it says, subject to the provisions of this Act or the rules made thereunder. Now, the object of section 21 is simply to secure the control of the Secretary of State and not to define the specific purposes for which the revenues of India may be employed or may not be employed. I will not take up the time of the House by referring to section 22 which by expressly forbidding operations beyond the frontier contemplates operations within the frontier and necessarily the maintenance of a military force within India. Nor is it necessary for me to refer to any of the other sections already referred to. But there is one section which I think has not been referred to by the Honourable the Law Member and to which I may make a reference, and it is this. Section 67-A (1) :

“ The estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Governor General in Council shall be laid in the form of a statement before both Chambers of the Indian Legislature in each year,”

and so on. Clause (3) states :

“ The proposals of the Governor General in Council for the appropriation of revenue or moneys relating to the following heads of expenditure shall not be submitted to the vote of the Legislative Assembly ”

and so on, and one of those heads is “ expenditure classified by the order of the Governor General in Council as defence.” What further authority do you want than this? But I prefer to rest the case in favour of the maintenance of an Army not merely upon section 67A, nor upon any of the other sections which are all perfectly relevant and which are of great weight, but upon the higher ground and the simpler ground that the maintenance of an Army and the defence of a country are part of the essential purposes of any civilised Government and any expenditure incurred for those purposes would be expenditure lawfully incurred on account of the Government of India. I think it unnecessary to take up the time of the House with any further observations.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I am afraid our sympathies ought to go to the Honourable Mr. Burdon in the very delicate position he has been placed by the Law Department of the Government of India. Here was a deliberate interpellation put by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala. First of all, we were told that the army is maintained under a particular Statute. That was on the 15th of January 1923. Then, my Honourable friend Mr. Ginwala politely drew the attention of the Honourable Mr. Burdon and asked “ Are you not referring to repealed Statutes?” The

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

Honourable Mr. Burdon, I take it, even if in the first instance he did not take the advice of the Law Department, I hope and I trust, and knowing Mr. Burdon as I do, I am sure, he did consult the Law Department before he gave the second answer; for, I am not sure he would have ventured to give an answer about "inherent power" without consulting this Department of the Government of India. What, then, did the Law Department advise Mr. Burdon? "Yes, they are repealed Statutes." Sir, I hope the Honourable the Law Member then looked up the Government of India Act, looked up all these sections which he referred to this morning, and he might have usefully referred to another section also which neither the paid department nor the unpaid department of the Law Department of the Government of India referred to this morning, which perhaps throws more light in their direction than they have laboured to point out; that is section 33 of the Government of India Act, which has been before me in dealing with this question. It refers to the Civil and Military Government of India, which perhaps is more apposite than all the laboured explanation which my Honourable friend sought to impute from the various other sections which he referred to. The powers of Civil and Military Government of India vest in the Governor General in Council subject to the orders of the Secretary of State. It is that section which has given me trouble in this matter, not the other sections referred to by my Honourable friends, both to the right and left of this House. Sir, the whole question is—and that is the question which has been missed by both my Honourable friends who spoke this morning—the question is, what is the right of the Government of India to maintain an army in times of *peace*, when there is no Military Government. No doubt Government maintains an army in times of peace, Sir, against the subjects of the Government. That also has to be remembered. I can understand the power of the Government to maintain an army to repel enemies from abroad to attack enemies within. Sir, for the purpose of internal peace, what right has any Government, unless that right is conferred by law, unless the Government is to be a Military Government, what right can the Government have to maintain an army unless it is empowered by law? I quite see from the regard which my Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer enjoyed in the Council Chamber in Madras, he is prepared to support and infer everything in favour of the Government, but, Sir, we who belong to the non-official world refuse to subscribe. Sir, if that is so, why should the Preamble of the Army Act in England say:

"Whereas it is illegal to maintain military forces in times of peace."

Mark the language, "it is illegal to maintain military forces in times of peace," therefore we enact such and such provisions. On the 19th of February 1923, an answer was given to this Assembly. I hope this Assembly is being treated seriously by the Law Department, not playfully. On the 19th of February 1923, the answer was given to us that these three Statutes had been repealed. Then under what power is this Army maintained? "Under the inherent power of the Crown." Sir, having said that on the 19th of February, today, when they are driven into a corner, the Law Department does not give up the inherent power, but invokes some other power, that is the implied power. If it was a plain statutory provision, lay people as we are, we would have asked for a reference to the particular section. Look at such and such a section. There would be no elaborate argument. The

very elaborate and laboured argument urged by our learned friend, the Law Member, shows how very weak the case is. I do not know how many of us have been convinced by this elaborate argument. I find it was an elaborate argument. What trust are we to place on it? Where are we now I want to know. What weight are we to attach to it as against the opinion given on the 19th February 1923? The matter is involved in serious doubt. I want this matter to be treated seriously. I am sorry if I bore the House in this matter. I quite recognise this is a constitutional question which cannot be discussed effectively or usefully on the floor of this House. We have raised this question and we want the Government of India to examine its position carefully and, if necessary, consult the law officers of the Crown, those famous law officers of the Crown in England, or eminent constitutional authority in this matter. Sir, we are not willing to take the law as laid down by either the Honourable the Law Member on the 19th of February, or to-day, or as laid down by the Honourable Sir P. Sivaswamy Aiyer for whose opinion I have the greatest respect, but I rather think the question was sprung upon him to-day, and I am sure he did not prepare for this and he gave an opinion offhand, which he seldom does, and therefore I attribute it to his innate sympathy for bureaucracy. But I do not want the House to decide this question. I do not think it was the object of Mr. Ginwala. It was not my object when I gave notice of this issue. We of the Assembly view this question with some seriousness. We will be very glad indeed if the Government will go to Parliament if they distrust us, or come to us and ask for legal authority if there is no legal authority. We are concerned, Sir, for this military expenditure and we want to see if it is really incurred legally. I ask the Government in all seriousness that the matter should not be disposed of in this light and easy manner in which they have attempted to dispose of it.

Sir Campbell Rhodes (Bengal: European): I move that the question, if there is one, be now put.

Sir Montagu Webb: On a point of order, may I ask if we shall have a further opportunity of discussing the Army Vote in other respects than this constitutional point?

Dr. H. S. Gour: When I rose to speak, Sir, I asked the Chair whether the other question was reserved for further discussion and I understood the Chair to say that it was.

Sir Montagu Webb: Then, Sir, my point is answered.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is that the question be now put. The motion was adopted.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: I ask for leave to withdraw this motion. The motion* was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

* "That the demand under sub-head 'Army Department' (page 47) be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock. Mr. Deputy President (Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy) was in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE AND BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, the following Message has been received from the Secretary of the Council of State:

"I am directed to inform you that the Bill to give effect to certain Articles of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, as passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting of the 9th March 1923, was passed by the Council of State at its meeting of the 15th March 1923, with the amendments indicated in the attached statement. The Council of State requests the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly in the amendments."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the table.

In accordance with Rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I also lay on the table the Bill to declare the law in force in certain territories of the district of Sambalpur and to provide that the past administration of those territories shall not be called in question on the ground that they were not included in the territories administered by the Government of the Central Provinces, which was passed by the Council of State on the 15 March, 1923.

THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

DEMAND NO. 14—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—*contd.*

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I am sorry my friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer is not here in his place. Nevertheless I have been told that one remark which I made during my speech just before Lunch was understood in an improper way, my reference to his "innate sympathy with the bureaucracy" and "unpaid" advocacy. It was far from my intention to impute anything to my Honourable and esteemed friend. I am very sorry I used that expression and I now withdraw it.

Munshi Iswar Saran (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Did you call upon me, Sir, to move No. 323?

Mr. Deputy President: Yes.

Munshi Iswar Saran: I beg your pardon, Sir. I was under a misapprehension. If you will allow me I shall move it now.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Is it to be taken that No. 317 is disposed of?

Mr. Deputy President: Yes.

Munshi Iswar Saran: If you will be pleased to allow me, Sir, I shall move No. 323. Thank you, Sir. I move:

"That the provision for sub-head 'Army Department' under the head 'General Administration' be reduced by Re. 1."

I wish to invite the attention of this House to the reduction that has been made in the sum set apart for the Territorial Force. As the time is very short I wish only to indicate the points on which I would like to invite the attention of the military authorities as well as of the Honourable Members of this House.

One may not be quite in perfect agreement with the details of the scheme of the territorial force, still the consensus of opinion amongst us is that all that can be done should be done in order to push forward this scheme of the territorial force. It is, therefore, to be deeply regretted that the meagre sum that was allowed for the scheme last year has been cut down by Rs. 10 lakhs.

Then there is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House very briefly and it is the announcement that was made about the Indianization of the Indian Army. Now, Sir, at the time that the announcement was made, I am afraid the Honourable Members of this House did not have the full scheme before them and therefore were not in a position to view the question in its proper perspective; but now the scheme has been supplied to us by the Army Department and we are in a position to really understand the full effect of the announcement that was made some time ago on the floor of this House. As it will be in the recollection of this House, it was said that 8 Indian units would be Indianised. Now what we find is from this scheme that it would take at least from 20 to 23 years to Indianise these 8 Indian units. Then there is this paragraph in this statement:

“ A question has been asked whether the experiment is to be fully tried before the next step is taken, that is to say, in dealing with the other units of the Indian Army. The point is one on which Government are not in a position to make a statement. It would obviously be premature to do so. The first measure of Indianisation has only now been embarked upon and the developments to which it may lead cannot be foreseen or foretold.”

So the result of it is this: that this first instalment as it were of this reform that we have got is to take about quarter of a century to come into full operation, and as regards the future developments of this scheme of Indianisation we know very little. For, as it is said, it is rather premature at this stage to say anything about what the future is going to be. I submit that this scheme, now that all the details have become public property and are known to all the Honourable Members of this House as well as to everybody outside this House, will not—I say so, Sir, after full deliberation—give satisfaction to the people. About a quarter of a century to be taken for the Indianisation of 8 units and the rest to remain in doubt and in uncertainty because the Government of India is not in a position to make any definite statement. I need not in this connection draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are various services of the Army Department to which no reference is made. The Indianisation for the present is to be confined to the Infantry and to the Cavalry; but as Honourable Members of this House are fully aware, there are other departments of the Army about the Indianisation of which the scheme is perfectly silent. I therefore submit, Sir, that this announcement which has been made is hardly satisfactory.

Sir Montagu Webb: Sir, this time last year in common with many other Members of this House I supported a motion for a nominal reduction in the vote of the Army Department in order to express the very great anxiety that I and others felt at the magnitude of the military

[Sir Montagu Webb.]

charges. Well, Sir, the Inchcape Committee have made their Report, and on the first page of their Report on Military Services, they write:

"The expenditure which has been incurred in the past may have been inevitable, but the question is whether India can afford to maintain military expenditure on the present scale as an insurance against future eventualities. In our opinion the repeated huge deficits of the last few years, in spite of the imposition of heavy new taxation, have made it abundantly clear that India cannot afford this expenditure."

That opinion, I submit, Sir, confirms the soundness and the statesmanlike character of the action taken by this House last year in making every effort in its power to cut down the military expenditure. A few paragraphs later on the Inchcape Committee write:

"We are informed that there is no idea in the mind of the Government of India of continuing a forward military domination up to the Durand line at the present time."

Notice those two qualifications "*up to the Durand line*" and "at the present time." The Honourable the Foreign Secretary informed us that it was the intention of Government to maintain what I can describe as a half forward policy, that is to say, to occupy a line half way through Waziristan, and it is in this connection that I desire to give expression to the anxiety which many of us are still feeling with regard to the crores and crores of rupees which are being poured into Waziristan. If I understood my Honourable friend the Foreign Secretary correctly the other day, he stated in eloquent language that the fundamental difficulty of this frontier problem was that the frontier districts "*breed too many and feed too few*," and that consequently the men of the hills have to come down into the plains in search of food and so forth. Now, I understand the present policy of Government is to construct a big lateral road at the foot of the hills, and another road behind the Mahsud territory and through Waziristan, and that it is proposed to employ local forces to police this road. I am still left in some uncertainty as to how the expenditure of all this money and the construction of these roads is going to cause the Waziris to breed LESS and to feed MORE?

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Buy more rifles.

Sir Montagu Webb: On the contrary, it seems to me that the expenditure of huge sums of money in this country may quite conceivably produce just the opposite effect and that we shall find the Mahsuds, strengthened and supplemented by the receipt of several crores of rupees, in possession of still more rifles and in a position to give more trouble than ever before. It is because I feel some uncertainty and anxiety in this connection that I should like some further explanation in this matter.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I endorse the view which has been put forward by the last speaker, but I should like to make an addition to it, and you will be surprised to hear, Sir, that so far as the special political expenditure in Waziristan went, it was Rs. 60,40,000 in 1922-23. The House will agree with me that this expenditure is very excessive and some portion of it must have been given to the people of Waziristan, and it is no wonder to me that some portion thereof might have been used by them in the purchase of arms, ammunition and rifles which may have been used, I am afraid, against the law-abiding and loyal subjects of His Majesty. Therefore, Sir, I submit that this heavy expenditure, which tells upon us, may be reduced as early as possible. With these few remarks, I resume my seat.

Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan (North-West Frontier Province:

3 P.M. Nominated Non-Official): Sir, some time back when there was debate of this question I strongly supported the close-border policy. I still stick to that. But unfortunately, the Honourable gentlemen who have spoken about the frontier and about the money spent on it, specially my learned friend, Dr. Nand Lal, are labouring under a wrong impression. They are mistaken if they think that they will altogether cut off the Mahsuds, so that they won't have any relation or anything to do with them. If they think they can keep them at arm's length they are mistaken. There are two alternatives before them. Either to subjugate them, which is both impracticable and impossible in the present circumstances, or the next best thing is to adopt the close-border policy which has been mentioned by Mr. Bray. I am afraid that the Honourable Members who say that the allowance which is paid to these Mahsuds and Afridis is a sort of bribery are altogether wrong and mistaken; they do not know that the money which is paid to them is in exchange for tolls, which they used to realise and enjoy in ancient times, and are now taken up by the Government instead. (Dr. Nand Lal: "I may point out to the Honourable Member that Afridis are different to Mahsuds.") Sir, I may at least expect this much from Dr. Nand Lal that, as when he speaks I listen to him patiently, he should do the same when I address the House. The tribes render also other services; for instance, they are responsible for keeping these roads safe and if any offence is committed on these roads they are held responsible for it. So, when you get some service from them, is it not fair to pay them something in return? When you enter into friendly relations with them, you must pay them what is their due. They have also got some rights, which must be respected. I am rather surprised at the suggestion made by some Honourable Members that, if you give them this money, they will get rifles with it. They don't know that these tribesmen are well-to-do people and as the Bokhara line is altogether open now and great trade is done in arms traffic they will not experience any difficulty on that account. Do you mean to say you think that they buy rifles with only the money you give them. That is not correct, on the other hand, it will be an inducement to them to behave well and render necessary services. Now, I will bring to your notice one important point which is that at present we are fighting a portion and not all the Mahsuds—we are fighting with only 1-10th of them, which has cost us so much in life and money. If all of them combine and fight us, you can easily judge the result. Even in the time of Sir Robert Sandeman, who pursued that policy of peace, do you mean to say he did not pay these people? If you think by not paying them you will have peace, you are mistaken. Even for the close-border policy you will have to spend money, although comparatively much less. You will have to increase the constabulary, you will have to increase your scouts, formerly the militia, you will have to construct towers and roads all along the border. Now, the question is, you have got two alternatives before you, either to occupy the country, and subjugate the people, for occupation you should give as much money as the military experts require or you must follow the close-border policy and grant the funds asked by the Political Department as the policy of occupation is rejected and the policy of close border is adopted, you should grant what they demand. Sir, if they cannot see their way to either then I think these Honourable gentlemen ought to go there and take charge themselves. I am sorry to say that the criticism on the frontier always causes the settled district people to suffer. I mentioned that last time and

[Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan.]

refer to it now. These cries against the frontier bring forth nothing but retrenchments, these retrenchments affect our legitimate demands. Retrenchment is just now thrust upon us and has recoiled on the people of the settled districts. On that account our education has greatly suffered; on that account everything else has suffered. I mean and refer to the report that was recently submitted by the Inchcape Committee. With due respect to the experience of such a great statesman, with due respect to his great services to India in general, I must say that we, the settled districts people, have become the victims of his report, which has specially nipped our education in the bud, as no further grant will be given to the Islamia College, Peshawar, and the present grant of the Hindu College, Dera Ismail Khan, will be altogether stopped in future.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Sir, what is the relevancy of this?

Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan: My Honourable friend says there is not relevancy. I will request him just to think for a moment. Sir, I simply want to clear the situation so as to enable the Honourable Members to see what they should do. My Honourable friend perhaps wants to make a speech. So, I do not like to take up the time of the House. I must end my speech with the request that it will be a great mistake if you deduct any money under the head of the North-West Frontier Province.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I very much regret, Sir, that my friend Mr. Burdon is not able to be here to answer for the Army Department owing to sudden illness. I cannot myself offer to undertake the defence of the Army Department; but I will endeavour to give Mr. Iswar Saran some information in reply to the points which were raised by him. The first related to the reduction of expenditure on the territorial force. The Budget stood at Rs. 40 lakhs last year; it is Rs. 30 lakhs this year. The reason for this is that last year the estimates provided for certain initial expenditure which will not have to be incurred this year. The Rs. 30 lakhs which is provided does not therefore mean a reduction in the territorial force. We were simply able to budget for Rs. 30 lakhs this year because last year we incurred the necessary initial expenditure for the existing battalions. There are now formed 20 units of infantry and 6 units University corps. There are still to be formed during the coming year 2 mechanical transport sections and 2 electrical companies and a field ambulance. I hope that these facts will disabuse Mr. Iswar Saran's mind of any idea that the reduction of expenditure in itself necessarily means a reduction in the strength of the territorial force. As regards the second point, he expressed disappointment, as a result of his study of the statement which was placed on the table by Mr. Burdon, in regard to the Indianisation of 8 Indian units. He laid great stress on the fact that it will take somewhat over 20 years to completely Indianise those units. That of course follows from a calculation of the length of time it takes to arrive at particular grades of rank in the Indian Army. The difficulty of course would be to expedite the process in the case of Indian officers at a rate over that which applies to British officers. He is, however, taking an extreme figure; the date he gives is the date at which they will be completely Indianised; the great bulk of officers in those units will, of course, be Indianised long before that period. It is, of course, the case that we have had to admit that we cannot foresee the process of

further Indianisation, namely, how long we should have to wait before the present experiment is regarded as successful and a further step forward be taken. But we cannot foresee the future. I will only put this to the House that it knows perfectly well that a process of this kind, when once begun, does not stop.

Munshi Iswar Saran: How long will it take?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: To answer that question would require a prevision which neither I nor any Member of Government could exercise. We have begun the process. The Honourable Member may well rest assured that if in the initial stage we are persuaded that the steps that we have taken in the Army are as successful as it has been elsewhere then the process will be more rapid than at present seems likely. With regard to the remaining criticisms that have been uttered on the subject of the Army to-day, they relate mainly to Waziristan. My Honourable friend Mr. Bray is here. He has already given the House a very full appreciation of the situation in Waziristan and of the policy decided on. The motion is for reduction of one rupee only. I have not heard from Members here any desire to condemn whole heartedly the policy which Mr. Bray has put forward. . . .

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: This is not the time or place for discussing such a large question. I would ask for a separate day for discussing that question.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I was coming to exactly the same conclusion as my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar. I was wondering whether in the course of demands for grants we could profitably discuss a question like that of Waziristan and I was going to leave the matter in the interrogative form to the House.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That the provision for sub-head 'Army Department' under the general head 'General Administration' be reduced by rupee one."

The motion was negatived.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, I am sorry that the Member in charge of the Department is not here to answer my question. (*Cries of "What is the number of the amendment?"*) The subject I wish to talk about is

(*Cries of "What number?"*)

Mr. Deputy President: It is almost the same as No. 316.

Dr. Nand Lal: I may invite your attention to No. 327. It does not relate to the same proposition.

Mr. Deputy President: I called upon the Honourable Member (Colonel Gidney) to move the amendment which stands here in his name. That amendment is not printed.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Regarding my amendment and with your permission, Sir, I wish to ask not for a reduction of Rs. 15,000 but for a reduction of one rupee only in the pay of the Assistant Secretary of the Army Department, Government of India. I do this to have an opportunity of bringing before this House certain matters in connection with the Military Medical Department.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I rise to a point of order. There is amendment No. 316 by Munshi Iswar Saran. You ruled that I could not move No. 317 and I also understand that you ruled that No. 316 could not be moved. This is only No. 316 repeated by Colonel Gidney.

Dr. H. S. Gour: And of which we had no notice.

Mr. Deputy President: If you object to the amendment on the score of want of notice I must rule it out of order.

(Then the Deputy President called upon Mr. Agnihotri to move his amendment).

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I do not know whether my amendment has been ruled out of order because I do not know whether it has been objected to formally.

Mr. Deputy President: Yes.

Munshi Iswar Saran: I just wish to know whether the recommendation of the Inchcape Committee in regard to the post of Inspector General of Irrigation has been carried out, and if not, when it is proposed to carry it out.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma (Revenue and Agriculture Member): The matter is being considered. It has not been decided yet what to do with this question and I think it will be decided very speedily.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Then I do not wish to move my amendment No. 326.*

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under sub-head 'Public Works Department' be reduced by Rs. 10,000."

As you know, the public works in the major provinces is a provincial transferred subject and the Irrigation Department also, though it is a reserved subject, is very intimately connected with the same department. Then the Government of India has not much to do with both the public works and irrigation and therefore in the face of this fact it seems to be hardly necessary that so much expenditure may be incurred by the Government of India. In support of my argument may I invite your attention to the report of the Retrenchment Committee. By making reference to the report, you will be pleased to see that the public works in the major provinces is a provincial transferred subject, while irrigation (I am reading from page 133), with which this department also deals is a provincial reserved subject in regard to which the powers of the provinces have been largely increased:

"We do not consider that a separate department of the Government of India is in the circumstances required to deal with such questions as concern that Government. We understand that a large amount of the work at present transacted by the department consists of estate work in connection with the properties of the Government of India, in Delhi and Simla, the allotment of houses, etc., etc., which could more appropriately be dealt with by local administrative officers than by a department of the secretariat. A Branch of the department deals with Posts and Telegraphs administration which we propose should be placed under the Communication Department."

* "That the provision for Inspector General of Irrigation under sub-head 'Public Works Department' be reduced by Re. 1."

In the presence of this recommendation my submission before the House is that the expenditure which we are incurring is not such an expenditure as is indispensably necessary and if the Honourable Member in charge of the Department will give me an undertaking that these recommendations will be appreciated and will be adopted, I shall not labour the point at all.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: All that I shall say now is that the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee on this question will be given very careful consideration. That is the answer which I gave to Munshi Iswar Saran also. I cannot usefully pursue this subject within the limited time at our disposal and therefore I shall not attempt to answer my Honourable friend. As I have said already, the recommendations are being considered and some of the money which is proposed to be saved under the head 'General Administration' includes the savings which would be the result of the re-grouping or re-amalgamation or partial retrenchment of some of the items included in this head also.

Dr. Nand Lal: In the circumstances I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: In the notice paper, I have stated that I intended to move for a reduction of Rs. 15 lakhs. With your permission, I will alter it to Rs. 5 lakhs. I move:

"That the demand under the head 'General Administration' (page 36) be reduced by Rs. 5 lakhs."

As suggested by our Leader of the National Party this morning, there is general agreement on both sides of the House that the reduction of 5 lakhs on this head "General Administration" is not too much. In fact, a good deal more might have been asked for, but as there is this consensus of opinion in favour of reduction only of Rs. 5 lakhs, I shall only ask for that amount. I will draw your attention to page 4 of the Revised Schedule of Demands, from which it would appear that the reduction proposed by the Inchcape Committee was Rs. 49,89,000, but effect was given to Rs. 36,37,000, so that there is a real margin of 13 lakhs from which I ask that Rs. 5 lakhs more should be deducted, and there would be Rs. 8 lakhs for what the Honourable the Finance Member described as the "lag." I think that is a very generous allowance even for a department which generally lags behind other departments. I move my amendment.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, I am glad at last to have this opportunity of my Honourable friend Mr. Ginwala's amendment to put forward certain points and obtain certain information regarding the Military Medical Department and in doing so, I wish to state at the outset that it is not my desire to sacrifice quality for quantity. Having been a member of the Indian Medical Service myself, I feel I can talk with some experience both as a Military and a Civil Medical Officer. Whilst carefully studying the various books with which we have been provided, it struck me, that there is room for a great deal of economy in this Department. A glance at the staff of the Military Hospitals (*vide* Army Estimates and Retrenchment Report) shows that there are 333 Royal Army Medical Officers entertained in India at a total cost of Rs. 39 lakhs per annum. That there are only 1,927 beds occupied per day in all the British Army Hospitals. This works out roughly to about 6 beds per officer. Of course, I am aware that

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

the R. A. M. C. Officer has other important duties to perform, e.g., sanitation, specialistic, daily outdoor sick, etc. I am intentionally confining my remarks to attendance on in-patients. Then, take the I.M.S. Military Department. There are 495 I.M.S. Officers entertained at a total cost of 47 lakhs of rupees per annum. The daily average occupation of Hospital beds in all Indian Army Hospitals is 4,506. This works out at about 10 beds per I. M. S. officer. Further examination into the personnel of the British Army Hospitals reveals the fact that there is a body called the R. A. M. C. Ranks, recruited from the same class as the British soldier but differs from him in that they receive a sort of a training as male nurses. These men, ill-educated and partly trained, have recently been brought out to India, I believe, with the ostensible purpose of replacing the I. M. D. in British Army Hospitals, but are to-day employed as male nurses. This corps has a total of 470 maintained at an annual cost of 6 lakhs. Besides this there are about 400 Military Assistant Surgeons I. M. D. costing Rs. 15 lakhs per annum who are employed in British Troops Hospitals and who, as per figures quoted, i.e., 1,927 beds in daily occupation, have 4½ patients to attend to daily per man. Then there is the Queen Alexandra's Military Nursing Service, which consists of about 233 nurses recruited from England and 66 in this country, total about 300. The Retrenchment Committee Report shows that in the British Army Hospitals there is a daily occupation of 1,927 beds and 4,506 in the Indian Army Hospitals. This works out to about 8 patients for each British Hospital nurse and about 68 patients to each Indian Hospital nurse, although the Member in charge of this department when I asked him a question in January last year replied to me that there were 38 beds per nurse in the British Hospitals and 100 per nurse in the Indian Military Hospitals. Besides this, Sir, there is an enormous menial personnel attached to the various military hospitals. It would weary this House if I went into further figures and percentages but with the personnel I have detailed it works out as follows: For the daily care of 1,927 in-patients in British Hospitals a staff of 1,465 trained personnel is employed whilst in Indian Military Hospitals a staff of 1,155 (i.e., I. M. S. officers and Sub-Assistant Surgeons) is engaged for the daily care of 4,500 in-patients. Now, Sir, take the total strength of all ranks of the British Army as 79,000 and the total strength of the Indian Army as 250,000; alongside this take the gross expenditure of the Army as 64 crores and then see what amount of this sum is spent for the upkeep of the Military Medical Department you get

Mr. P. P. Ginnwala: I rise on a point of order. This does not come within General Administration.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: From the calculation I have made it works out that the total military medical expenditure is almost 1/20th of the total military expenditure of the Army. In other words it works out that for the medical needs of every soldier (British and Indian) in this country, it costs the Indian tax-payer Rs. 100 per soldier per annum. Delve a little further into the figures supplied to us and it will be seen that each British soldier costs the country Rs. 78-8 per annum in medical personnel alone (not to mention the more expensive items as diet, housing, menial establishment, clothing, etc.), while the Indian sepoy costs only Rs. 23 per annum, less than one-third of the British soldier. Now, Sir, if you refer to the Inchcape Committee's Report you will notice a fuller

list of the personnel than those referred to in my percentages on pages 20-21. You will also notice that that Committee has exposed the fact that in the British Army whilst 8,270 Hospital beds are provided and fully maintained, the daily average occupation is only 1,927 patients, *i.e.*, less than one-fourth of the beds are utilised. Whereas in the Indian Army for which 12,703 beds are provided, only 4,506 are in daily occupation, *i.e.*, a little more than one-third is utilised. Assuming we accepted this one-fourth and one-third as the actual in-patient hospital needs (I do not suggest this for one moment) of the army, surely one is entitled to suggest a bigger reduction than what the Committee have already suggested, namely, 5½ lakhs. Let us for a moment forget the professional view of the matter which I admit demands surplus hospital accommodation to meet the needs of unhealthy months when more beds are occupied, also epidemics, etc., and look at it from a purely business or tax-payer's point of view and from which this expenditure cannot be dissociated. Well, what do we observe? Personnel, both superior and subordinate, accommodation, equipment, etc., are maintained at the cost of the Indian Exchequer to three times or at least twice as much as the actual medical requirements of the armies in this country. Is this necessary? Is this fair to the Indian tax-payer? Is this sound business? Is it sound finance? I would like to know how any business concern could be run on these lines. I should like to ask my friend, Mr. Darcy Lindsay, as an assurance expert, what it would work out per year to any firm if it had to pay a premium of Rs. 100 per each one of its employees. Now, Sir, the waste in this department was so glaring that the Inchcape Committee found it necessary to suggest a reduction of 53 lakhs out of a total revised estimate of about 3 crores apart from other savings suggested. Assuming that this were a votable item and dealing with it on the question of supply and demand as a business proposition purely, this House would be entitled not to call for a retrenchment of 53 lakhs as has been suggested but of almost 2 crores. This for reasons already given would be a fallacious argument. Nor do I suggest it. Moreover the figures and percentages quoted by me are rough and have been extracted from the mass of figures to illustrate my argument and to demonstrate on what lines retrenchment can be effected in the Military Budget. I speak as a medical man and I have no hesitation whatever in assuring this House that the Military Medical Department offers *par excellence* a most fertile field for substantial financial retrenchment, even much more than has been suggested by the Inchcape Committee. I now propose to show this House how this retrenchment can be effected. The nurses employed in British Hospitals belong to the Queen Alexandra Nursing Service, and are recruited in England at a total cost of about 9 lakhs. I ask here—Is this expenditure necessary and is this service a necessity, especially when I tell this House that there is ample and suitable material in this country from which to get nurses of equal ability and at a much cheaper rate without any desire to decry or undervalue the admirable services rendered by this service to the British soldier. Yet I consider its retention in India under the circumstances detailed—a *finesse* or a *frilling* to the medical needs of our troops, and not an absolute necessity. The day of white nurses for white troops is gone, and the expenditure incurred on this service not only increases our army estimates but deprives nurses trained in and of this country, both Indian and other communities, of employment. During the war nurses from India were largely employed and were then found quite good enough for British troops and their war records prove what splendid work they did, but, now, with peace they are considered not good enough and nurses are imported from England on much

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

higher wages. I consider, Sir, that this is a wanton waste of money, and that these nurses should be replaced by the trained women of this country. Why should the British Army in India need not only their food but their nurses from England? The time is not far distant when every military medical officer will be recruited in this country. That was the object of the Resolution, which I called my Medical Swaraj Resolution, which I brought before this House last year, but which was rejected. I make bold, however, to now say that in a short time a similar Resolution will yet be accepted by this House. I therefore submit that that is one of the means of retrenchment in the military expenditure and I present it for the serious consideration of the Member in charge. My next suggestion is as regards Assistant Surgeons. Here, you have a body of men 400 strong costing the State annually 15½ lakhs whose training of 4 and 5 years has been and is being debited to the Indian Exchequer. They are fully qualified and trained professional men who can sign certificates of life and death and whose certificates of licence are equivalent to those of any imported medical man for an Indian Court of Law. These men of the I. M. D. are appointed to British hospitals in a professional capacity subordinate to the R. A. M. C. officer. But as a matter of fact what duties are assigned, to these men? They are used as glorified compounders not as professional men, following behind R. A. M. C. officers whilst they stroll through the wards taking down prescriptions and making entries in the diet sheets. That is how these professional men are used in British Military Hospitals. Why? Because I suppose the R. A. M. C. officers feel that their professional work cannot be shared with these subordinates. Anyhow, here we have an efficient body of professional men costing us 15½ lakhs per annum and I have no doubt many in this House have received treatment from this body of men whose services and salaries are wasted in British Hospitals simply because they are refused their proper position. I understand that it was, and may be is still, the intention of the D. M. S. India to replace these professional men by a body of poorly educated, partly trained European male nurses recruited in England called R. A. M. C. Ranks, 470 of whom are to-day employed in British Hospitals in India at an annual cost of 6 lakhs. It may interest and greatly surprise this House to know that the Privates and N. C. Os. of this Corps receive higher salaries including allowances than the junior classes of Military Assistant Surgeons. Can you conceive of anything more wasteful than the employment of this corps, than the replacement of Military Assistant Surgeons by such a body of men and who to make matters worse receive a higher salary.

I submit, Sir, for the very serious consideration of the Honourable Member in charge and this Honourable House that this R. A. M. C. (Ranks) should be forthwith abolished as not only unnecessary but a colossal waste of public money. They are of no use to-day. They were not found necessary before for British Hospitals and why should they be necessary now? This attempt to replace a fully qualified body of Assistant Surgeons by another body of partly trained, comparatively ill-educated male nurses is, I consider, a criminal spoliation of public money.

Now, Sir, I also submit for the serious consideration of the Honourable Member in charge that the strength of the R. A. M. C. officers should be markedly reduced. To call upon this House to permit an annual expenditure of 37 lakhs of rupees for the maintenance of 333 R. A. M. C.

officers who have about 6 in-patients per day per doctor is a ridiculous waste of money. The same remarks apply with almost equal cogency to the I. M. S. I know, Sir, that these officers do other duties, such as Serologists, Bacteriologists, Public Health Officers and so on; but that does not detract from the strength of my argument or its cogency. I am seriously tempted—nay, I feel I am entitled to ask the Military authorities as also this Honourable House whether it is really necessary for British soldiers when they come out to India to bring their own nurses with them—a privilege that is even not enjoyed except by a few English babies when they come to this country. Queen Alexandra Service Nurses have done noble and admirable work in the past and also to-day but the time has come owing to this enormous military budget for replacing them with nurses recruited and trained in this country and who can be obtained at a lower cost—at least Rs. 100 less. Excluding other incidental expenses, e.g., passage to and from England, etc. I offer this as another way of effecting further retrenchment in the Military Medical expenditure.

The last point I wish to suggest to the Member in charge is that if the British Military Hospitals cannot find suitable and legitimate work for the Military Assistant Surgeon, then say so. Free them from the undignified and profitless work to which they are put and transfer their services bodily to Civil India which to-day crying out for trained medical men. Refuse to allow the Army authorities to use these trained Military Assistant Surgeons as glorified compounders and clerks to R. A. M. C. officers and so help to still further reduce the Military budget.

Rai Bahadur L. P. Sinha (Gaya cum Monghyr: Non-Muhammadan): I rise to support the motion moved by my friend Mr. Ginwala and in doing so I will confine my remarks to the reorganisation of the five Departments only. The Retrenchment Committee recommended the fusion of the five Departments, namely, that of Education, Revenue, Commerce, Industries and Public Works, and to divide again into two Departments, namely, General and Commerce. They showed by a statement, at page 134 of the Retrenchment Committee's Report, that the total cost of all these five Departments, according to the Budget for 1922-23, is Rs. 24,68,900, and their recommendation was to reduce this expenditure to 13 lakhs by the reconstitution of these two Departments. So thereby they suggested a reduction of Rs. 11,68,000, of which they thought one lakh will be required for the expansion of the Board of Revenue and Staff. Thus the ultimate saving proposed by the Committee was Rs. 10,68,000. But, Sir, Government in their revised Schedule of Demands accepts to reduce only a sum of 5 lakhs, thereby leaving Rs. 5,68,000 unreduced. In supporting the motion I would commend to Government the proposal of a further reduction of 5 lakhs which I think will not be very unreasonable on my part to demand considering that even then Government will have Rs. 68,000 for their terminal charges for these Departments. Lastly, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the figures taken into account by the Retrenchment Committee in proposing their reductions were the figures of the original Estimate for the year 1922-23. Presumably the revised budget figures for the same year were not placed before the Committee and in my opinion had the revised figures for those five Departments which is nearly 2 lakhs less than the original Budget figures been placed before the Committee, their proposed reductions would have been still greater. With these remarks, Sir, I beg to support the motion.

Mr. A. F. L. Brayne (Finance Department: Nominated Official): Sir, I might perhaps be able to explain the position and indicate what Government have been able to do in this matter. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, pointed out that the reductions recommended by the Committee amounted to about 49 lakhs and that Government had reduced only 36 lakhs leaving 13 lakhs still to be taken off. Now, when Mr. Ginwala was dealing with that budget head, he was dealing with a very much wider field of expenditure than that which is now under the consideration of the House, namely, Demand No. 14, General Administration. If the House will turn to page 126 of the Report of the Retrenchment Committee, they will find in paragraph 2 that this budget head includes about 22 lakhs of expenditure in the minor administrations, which is distributed over the North-West Frontier Province, Delhi and various other minor administrations. There is also expenditure of about 70 lakhs in England which covers the cost of the India Office and the High Commissioner. Under the head General Administration, we are only concerned with the Governor General and staff, the Executive Council, the Legislative bodies, the Secretariat and attached offices. Now, under the first three heads, the Governor General, Executive Council and Legislative bodies, it is not intended either by the Retrenchment Committee or, as I understand, by the House to make any reduction at all. That leaves us with the Secretariat and attached offices. Now, on page 144 of the Report the Committee indicate their conclusions. As regards the Secretariat, they say that there should be reductions amounting to 14 lakhs, and under the head Attached Offices, which are shown at page 135 of the Report, they indicate savings of Rs. 3,95,000. The total savings thus indicated amount to 18 lakhs. Now, against that, the Government have taken Rs. 8,67,000 in the budget out of the 14 lakhs proposed for the Secretariat; and out of the Rs. 3,95,000 proposed for the attached offices they have taken Rs. 3 lakhs, that is to say, out of 18 lakhs proposed for reduction Government have carried 12 lakhs into the budget. That leaves 6 lakhs to be dealt with. Now, is it at all possible to reduce another 5 lakhs from that 6 lakhs? The 5 lakhs will be found as follows: at page 134 of the Report the Committee indicates certain savings under various departments, Foreign and Political, Home, Legislative, Finance; those savings have already been carried into the budget within a few thousand rupees. They show that certain other departments costing about 24 lakhs might be amalgamated into two departments the cost of which would be about 14 lakhs, taking into account a lakh for the expansion of the Board of Revenue; that is to say, they indicate a saving of 10 lakhs. Government have only taken into account 5 lakhs there for the simple reason that they have to allow for a very considerable lag and terminal charges. Even supposing that a decision were arrived at on this subject to-morrow it could not be carried into effect in time to secure a larger saving than 5 lakhs for the simple reason that the Secretary of State's sanction has to be obtained to reduction of some appointments. Further, we have to give three months' notice to staff. Those who are discharged will go on leave and their leave allowances will continue to be carried against the Budget. Therefore, so far as can be seen there is no possibility of saving more than 5 lakhs under this head.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That the demand under the head ‘General Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 5,00,000.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—53.

Abdul Majid, Sheikh.
Abdul Quadir, Maulvi.
Abdulla, Mr. S. M.
Agarwala, Lala Girdharilal.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.
Barua, Mr. D. C.
Basu, Mr. J. N.
Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Das, Babu B. S.
Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
Girdhardas, Mr. N.
Gour, Dr. H. S.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jamall, Mr. A. O.
Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr.
Jatkar, Mr. B. H. R.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Lakshmi Narayan Lal, Mr.
Lathe, Mr. A. B.
Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.
Man Singh, Bhai.
Misra, Mr. B. N.
Mudaliar, Mr. S.
Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
Nag, Mr. G. C.
Nand Lal, Dr.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
Ramji, Mr. Manmohandas.
Rangachariar, Mr. T.
Reddi, Mr. M. K.
Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Mr.
Singh, Babu B. P.
Sinha, Babu Ambica Prasad.
Sinha, Babu L. P.
Sinha, Beohar Raghubir.
Sircar, Mr. N. C.
Sohan Lal, Mr. Bakshi.
Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. H.

NOES—34.

Abdul Rahim Khan, Mr.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Achariyar, Rao Bahadur P. T.
Srinivasa.
Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
Allen, Mr. B. C.
Blackett, Sir Basil.
Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
Bray, Mr. Denys.
Brayne, Mr. J. F. L.
Bridge, Mr. G.
Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.
Clark, Mr. G. S.
Cotelingham, Mr. J. P.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.
Haigh, Mr. P. B.
Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.

Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
Holme, Mr. H. E.
Hullah, Mr. J.
Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
Ley, Mr. A. H.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Mitter, Mr. K. N.
Moir, Mr. T. E.
Munammad Ismail, Mr. S.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Sams, Mr. H. A.
Sassoon, Capt. E. V.
Spence, Mr. R. A.
Townsend, Mr. C. A. H.
Webb, Sir Montagu.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, before the final question is put, I must try once again to explain what the position is. Under the estimate for General Administration we have made a cut which is the best estimate we can make of what would be the effect of putting into force at the earliest possible moment all the cuts recommended by the Incheape Committee, including the cuts which various Members of the House have to-day expressed their desire not to see enforced. The House has made a cut of five lakhs over and above that. Now, Sir, we do not produce estimates in which there is five lakhs which we can spare. It is out of the question that we should make a cut of five lakhs in this case and at the same time carry on the administration. The House must realise its

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

responsibility. We have done our very best to present estimates representing the minimum that we should spend if we carried out all the Inchcape Committee's recommendations. The House has questioned some of these recommendations and has yet made a further cut of five lakhs. That is the position.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): We have been told that the Government made all the cuts which the Inchcape Committee recommended. May I point out that the Inchcape Committee on page 144 recommended a saving of Rs. 14,08,000 on item No. 1 and of Rs. 3,95,000 on item No. 2 that is to say, about Rs. 18 lakhs, out of which Government have made a cut of 8.67 lakhs on item No. 1 and 3 lakhs on item No. 2, in all 11.67 lakhs; that is, short of the Inchcape Committee's recommendations by 6.3 lakhs.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That is exactly the position. As I have said before, we have presented an estimate which represents the best view that we can have of what would be the expenditure next year if we put all the Inchcape Committee's recommendations into force at the earliest possible moment. There must be an allowance for lag. Those recommendations are not in force to-day. They will not be in force on the 1st of April. As the Inchcape Committee themselves have taken pains to point out, their figures are the figures for a year in which the recommendations would be in full force as from the 1st of April without any allowance for lag or terminal charges.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: The question is whether at the end of the year you will be able to make that reduction or not.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The answer is in the negative.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam: I rise to a point of order, Sir. I am afraid this post-war discussion probably is not entirely in order.

Mr. Deputy President: I am afraid that the Chair cannot help the Government in this matter. The vote has been carried by the Assembly.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I will only add, Sir, that if the Honourable the Finance Member has any difficulty where to make the cuts, we will assist him.

(Mr. Deputy President then called on Dr. Gour.)

Mr. P. P. Ginnwala: I have got one, Sir, No. 338. I beg to move, Sir:

"That the demand under the head 'General Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy President: I think the demand for reduction by Rs. 5 lakhs having been carried, these drop out. I thought Dr. Gour was going to speak on the question which has just been moved by Sir Basil Blackett.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I was then going to say that if the Honourable the Finance Member has any difficulty where to make his cuts from, Members of this House will gladly place their services at his disposal and show him to do it.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I shall be delighted to accept any assistance of that sort, but I defy the Honourable Member to show where I am to cut these particular items on which a vote has

just been taken by the Rs. 5 lakhs which the House has requested us to cut. It is no good saying there are cuts elsewhere. The cuts must be here. The House has given Rs. 5 lakhs less for our expenditure under these heads than the minimum that we estimated. It is no good saying that there are cuts elsewhere. That does not touch the question.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 68,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘General Administration.’”

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: Before the demand is put I should like to make a few observations. Sir, I was under the impression that at this stage the House would be in a position to express its general opinion on the General Administration of the country during the last 12 months and with that idea I gave notice of my amendment No. 338. I do not wish, however, to weary a House which is already wearied with debate, but I think it is our duty to point out to the Government by way of a parting gift before we leave this demand as to what we think of the administration as a whole. The Honourable the Finance Member has just now suggested

Mr. Deputy President: Is the Honourable Member moving his amend-
4 P.M. ment?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: I am speaking on the general motion.

Mr. Deputy President: I thought we had been talking about this for the last two days.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: I am now summing up the results. The President himself suggested this

Mr. Deputy President: That was when the motion for a reduction of the General Administration charges came up. I thought Members had an opportunity of speaking on these matters in detail.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: We wanted to raise this general debate on the General Administration as a whole. We were then told that an opportunity will arise at a later stage when this can be done. I offered no arguments at all on the motions for reduction and I submit that the House is entitled to express its opinion on the General Administration as a whole. I am not going into any particular Department at all. My submission is this that the Honourable the Finance Member in his speech as well as the other Government Members who have spoken have bewailed the series of deficits which we have had to face and have traced many of the causes for these deficits, but the most important and obvious cause was never hit upon by them, that is, the past extravagance of the administration of this country. Last year the House may remember we moved a very small reduction of Rs. 25 lakhs in the Railways Demand and we were told that it would be disastrous if as much as Rs. 25 lakhs were deducted from the Administration charges. We have seen now the result. They themselves have been able to save about 2 crores of rupees on their original estimate and this year they have submitted practically to a Rs. 4½ crores reduction. Though of course, we do not propose to censure them in respect of whatever their conduct may be in the future with regard to expenditure, I think it is the

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

duty of the House to let them know what we think of their past expenditure. There are many other points to which reference may be made in dealing with General Administration. There is the question of the Army. We are entirely dissatisfied even now with their Army policy. Sir Montagu Webb objected to the expenditure which was still being incurred, and for that not any one particular Member of the Government is responsible but the whole Government is responsible. Then there was this question of votable and non-votable subjects. They have as a Government, as I said this morning, restricted the scope of the votable items in some places and extended the scope of the non-votable items, and this House cannot allow . . . (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "And vice versa.") But we do not object to a non-votable item being made votable. (*Dr. H. S. Gour*: "That is our right.") We positively object to a votable item being made non-votable. This is the only opportunity which we can get to express our opinion on these various aspects of general administration. I hope the Government will show a certain amount of penitence and that they are on the way to mend their extravagant habits of expenditure and . . .

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I rise to a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the Honourable Member's speech, but I should like to know what we are discussing. (*Cries of "General Administration."*) What is the question? It has not been placed before us (*Cries of "Remarks on General Administration."*)

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: I am sorry that the Honourable Member is so impatient of any remarks in the nature of censure on his Government . . .

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I am only anxious to know what is going on.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: I am trying to point out to the House that I think it is imperative on it to draw the attention of Government to the fact—even though we have the highest opinion of each individual Member of the Government which no doubt many of us have—that as a body we have not got such a favourable opinion of them as administrators. If the House does not express its opinion now I would like to know when it will. In these remarks though I was not allowed to move a formal nominal vote of reduction I have sufficiently explained my own views upon the work of Government as a whole, during the last twelve months.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I do not think that it is the desire of the House that a reply should be made at this point to a motion which was, with all deference to the Chair, so entirely out of place. We have devoted two days for the general discussion of the affairs of Government and its administration. Some 40 Members spoke on that occasion. We have devoted now very nearly three days to detailed discussion on separate items of administration. There have been some hundreds of motions tabled, in the course of which individual aspects of the administration have come under discussion. Now we come to a stage, in which you have put before the House the final demand for grant for General Administration, that is, the expenditure on the Secretariats and the Legislative bodies. I notice that no one chose that opportunity for initiating a general discussion on the conduct of the Legislative bodies. The Honourable Member however thinks that he is in place in taking this opportunity for a general criticism of the whole course of Government Administration. I doubt whether that

is really the desire of the House that we should here and on this occasion, an occasion so entirely out of place, seek to justify the whole of our administration in past years. We are well aware of the somewhat bitter, somewhat irreconcilable attitude that is frequently taken by some Members of the House in regard to every action of the Government, good or bad. Take only one point. We know that when we do our best for retrenchment by appointing a powerful committee like the Inc'cape Committee, and loyally accepting its recommendations, nevertheless there are those who express the most extreme form of dissatisfaction because we cannot make the whole of the reductions with immediate effect. - Again, we are told that we have deliberately, and perhaps this is the worst insinuation of all, attempted to extend the classification of non-votable items, whereas the fact probably is that the re-classifications made actually extend the items on which the House has to vote. I conceive that I shall not be doing my duty if I were now to detain the House by a long debate on points such as these or by a lengthy review of all that we have done in the past. On a statement such as Mr. Ginwala made, I decline altogether to accept his good opinion of the individual Members of the Government. I treat that kindness on his part with complete contempt; for we must be judged as a body and as a whole. I maintain that he is doing, and he knows that he is doing nothing but wasting the time of the House in attempting to raise a general discussion of this nature on this particular motion.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 68,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘General Administration’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 10—INDIAN POSTAL AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank (P. W. D. Secretary): Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,07,98,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘the Indian Postal and Telegraph Department’.”

Sir, at the outset I would invite the attention of Honourable Members to the report of the Indian Retrenchment Committee, page 107, item No. 8 under the head of “conclusions” from which they will see that that Committee made proposals for a reduction of the colossal sum of Rs. 1,37,27,000 in the Budget Estimate for 1923-24 for this Department. This reduction has to be made against the items detailed in the last right-hand column of Appendix A which will be found on page 109 of the same Report. As against this very large sum, the department has by a Herculean effort—I may almost say—effected reductions which amount to about 128 lakhs of rupees, which is therefore only a few lakhs short of the total reduction which was recommended by the Committee. Honourable Members will no doubt realise that in a department like the Post and Telegraph Department, which is a commercial department depending very largely on its business for the revenue which it receives and in which it has obligations, commitments, agreements, contracts and other undertakings to fulfil, it is an extremely difficult matter to make reductions on this very large scale.

[Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank.]

As an instance of the difficulties which we have to contend with, I will just read out a telegram which we received yesterday :

“ At overflowing meeting last night of members, Indian Telegraph Association, Calcutta Centre, comprising all grades and ranks traffic and engineering branches, unanimously resolved respectfully to submit following to Government. Meeting views with grave concern suggestions and recommendations Incharge Committee as touching possible reduction in pay, discontinuance of house rent and other allowances and free quarters as also reduction in engineering and traffic higher appointments and respectfully urges on Government the rejection of these recommendations which are viewed as arbitrary, harsh and unjustifiable, and as creating substantial grounds for widespread discontent. Resolution has support of entire Association and staff throughout India and Burma. Majority staff and families in dire poverty, children ill-fed, ill clad, while schooling beyond their means; any reduction in pay or allowances can only reduce them to state desperation; earnestly pray protection against recommendations in question.”

Many other telegrams of a like nature have been received from powerful unions and associations throughout the country. In putting forth their amendments, I would venture to ask Honourable Members gravely to consider the difficulties and disabilities which we had to contend with in making this very large cut of 128 lakhs and to remind Members that, as I have already stated, we have done our most.

Mr. B. N. Misra: Sir, I beg to move:

“ That the provision for Working Expenses under the head ‘ Indian Postal and Telegraph Department ’ (page 31) be reduced by Rs. 25,000.”

When I sent this amendment asking for a reduction of working expenses, I made up my mind to point out the top-heavy administration of this Postal and Telegraph Department. Sir, if we compare the increase of work since 1913-14 to about 1921-22 and if we compare the increase of officers and staff, we find that really the increase of officers in the Postal and Telegraph Department has been nearly 32 per cent., whereas in regard to the staff the increase is by about 17 per cent. In the two departments really the officers have been increased in such large numbers that it costs much more than is really desirable in the interests of the working of the departments. The staff has been increased only by 17 per cent. Moreover I find the increase of expenditure is more in the Telegraph Department, although the Department, as was pointed out by the Honourable Mover, is a commercial concern. The Postal Department pays more revenue to the Government and it transacts much pecuniary business, Savings Bank, Registration, and many other branches which fetch more revenue. But I see less money has been spent on it, whereas on the Telegraph Department much more money has been spent and the increase of revenue has not been really so much. Of course there is no separate accounts and we do not find the income separately shown, but really that will be found to be the case if the matter is scrutinised. Then, Sir, we find the pay in both the departments is very disproportionate. In the Telegraph Department you find the pay of these officers is much more, whereas people who transact very responsible business such as receiving money orders or savings bank deposits and have heavy and responsible transactions in money are paid much less. I beg to point out to the House that even in England these services are not paid on a separate scale. They give the same pay to both the branches. I fail to see why in India a separate pay and a very much higher scale of pay should be paid to the Telegraph Department, and why the Postal Department

should not be paid on the same scale. I had in my mind several other details to point out but I do not do so now. The Retrenchment Committee desire retrenchment of some items which are very undesirable. They propose to take away some postal peons and take away some small officers whose pay is very small but who render much service to the public and whose retention will be very beneficial to the public, but they want to keep many highly paid officers at the top who really do nothing except perhaps supervise, and do not really do useful work for the public. I find there are several amendments in this matter and especially one by Dr. Gour who asks for a reduction of 10 lakhs, and as I ask for a small sum, I must leave my arguments to be advanced by Dr. Gour. I wish him success and I hope he will get this 10 lakhs. In his favour I withdraw.

Mr. Deputy President: I consider it a useless taking up of time for the Honourable Member to have made all these remarks and then to have withdrawn the amendment which stands in his name. If he wanted to withdraw in favour of Dr. Gour, it was open to him to do so without making this speech.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, my motion runs as follows :

“That provision for ‘Indian Postal and Telegraph Department—Working Expenses (Stores and Working Establishment—Voted Expenditure)’, Appendix A, be reduced by Rs. 500.”

I recognise that the Indian Postal and Telegraph Department is a very useful department. It is apt to be considered the eye and ear of the public. It is a department through whose services one can speak to one's relations and friends at a great distance. I will not trouble the House with details, but there is one aspect of the question, which has induced me to offer certain suggestions. One is this, that in the Telegraph Department the Indian element, especially at those telegraph offices which are located in big cities, is comparatively very small. May I invite the attention of the Government of India to this point?

The second point which I wish to place before the House is this, that lots of printing is done, and I am told that private printers are not given full share in this work.

The third point, which has been considered a great grievance by the public, is this, that stores are purchased and that a very large portion of those stores is not purchased in India. If this is a fact, and if this complaint which has reached me has got any truth in it, then I hope that the Government of India will, for the future, take some suitable measures that this grievance on the part of Indians may be properly and adequately redressed.

The other point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that last year we seriously suggested to the Government of India, especially to the Honourable the Finance Member, that if we were to abolish the quarter-anna post card, most probably that abolition would not eventually pay us and that, instead of gaining something, we might lose. If my information is correct, then I think that eventuality has happened. I hope that Government this year will kindly give serious consideration to the suggestion which was put forward last year and which, most probably, may be repeated this year.

The same complaint may be urged, in the form of a repetition, in connection with the enhancement of postage in connection with letters, that is, from half an anna to one anna. So far as my information also in this

[Dr. Nand Lal.]

connection goes, the Postal Department has not gained much. I therefore hope that the Government of India will give serious attention to this question also; this time it is not too late for the Government to think of it. In this Department, serviceable as it no doubt is, we should try to see that the system which we adopt and the rates which we may fix may be such a system and such rates as may be able to fetch more money for us, that is this fixity of rates should be on business lines, a rate which will invite the public to make use of the Post Office. Allow me to say that this increase in the rate of postage has put a clog in the way of the poor people to have communications with their relations and with their kith and kin, and in certain quarters it has been considered an impediment in the way of some commercial people also.

The last point, which I have got to urge, and which is equally serious, so far as its character goes, is that some complaints have reached me to show that when the public goes to some of the big Post Offices they are sometimes detained and in the case of letters sent to the Post Office, the answers are given too late. If these complaints are correct, then the Government of India will be kind enough to see that this complaint is also remedied.

With these few remarks I submit this amendment before the House and, if the Honourable Member in charge will give me some undertaking that these grievances will be attended to seriously by the Government of India, I shall not press the point very much.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: Sir, it may assist the House in curtailing the discussion if I make a general statement as to the efforts we have had to make in order to comply with the suggestions of the Retrenchment Committee to reduce recurring expenditure met from Revenue to the extent of 137 lakhs and from Capital to the extent of 50 lakhs. The Department loyally submitted to this recommendation almost wholly, because we felt that it was undesirable in the present financial condition of the country to press for the full expenditure which would be really necessary to keep the Department efficient, well staffed and ready to take up the work which has been steadily flowing in during the last few months. They have agreed, I may state to the House, to some retrenchments even to a greater extent than has been suggested by the Retrenchment Committee in order to be able to accept the figure of 137 lakhs within a very narrow margin, and in order to do so, the straits to which they have proceeded will be realised by Honourable Members when they know that they have to submit to a grant for maintenance and repair of postal buildings amounting only to Rs. 73,000 as against a normal figure of Rs. 4,23,550. That is, they had to agree to a cut of Rs. 3,50,000 upon maintenance and repair of buildings, and a cut of a lakh on telegraph buildings.

It would be detaining the House unduly long if I were to go through the various retrenchments which the Department had to submit to, and which the Government had to accept. Suffice it to say that, in view of the diminution in the amount of work that was due to trade depression largely, we agreed to a small reduction under the head of Staff, and to a considerable reduction under various items, aggregating as Sir Sydney put it, roughly to 129 lakhs under Revenue and 50 lakhs under Stores. I think further, Sir, it would be impossible to go further without sacrificing completely all efficiency and producing an amount of discontent which no Department can afford to face.

Well, a good deal of apprehension is being entertained by the staff, but we hope that we shall be able to continue, without any very substantial retrenchment, most of the staff at present working under the various departments, without seriously affecting any emoluments they have been drawing as the result of the recommendations of the Postal Committee and the Telegraph Committee which sat two years ago. There seems to be an impression due no doubt to a statement made in the Retrenchment Committee Report that the number of officers in this department has grown out of proportion to the increase of work since 1913-14. I may correct that misapprehension because it was due to the fact that a number of officers who were drawing less than Rs. 200 and who were not included within the figures of 1913-14 were, owing to the recommendations of the Postal Committee having been given effect to, brought on a scale at which they were drawing more than Rs. 200; there is no increase in strength or increase in numbers as stated; they were brought under the head of officers drawing 250 or more and consequently there is an increase from 514 to 678. As a matter of fact if those who have been promoted by reason of those increments be deducted, you will have to reduce the figure by about 70 so that the proportion is exactly to the increase in the work and Honourable Members will see therefore that on the postal side there has been no undue increase at all in the number of officers.

I may point out another error which has crept in with regard to the telegraph figures. We are actually 16 under strength if we are to take the recommendations of the Telegraph Committee which sat in 1920 as to what should be the proper strength to do a certain amount of work. But we had to put up with that deficiency and we mean to put up with that deficiency because it would be unreasonable to increase the strength at a moment of financial stress like this. There seems to be also a general idea that there is a very large number of very highly paid officers in this department and retrenchment might just as well be effected in the upper ranks with financial benefit and without considerable loss of efficiency. I may point out, Sir, that the committee which sat to investigate the grievances of the postal staff found that the number of higher offices open to the staff was remarkably low in this department. 14,500 or 14,700 clerks had very few higher offices open to them; you have got about 181 or more superintendents and a large number of postmasters, and the higher appointments which are open to these were considered low and they have made recommendations to improve their prospects. Therefore the number of higher officers in this department is not relatively as large as perhaps would be urged as desirable in the interests of the staff. I shall not take up the time of the House by pointing out how the figure is smaller than it is perhaps in some other departments and how economically this department has been working with the staff at its disposal; but we have agreed to reduce some of the highly paid posts having regard to the considerations I have already mentioned. During recent years there has been a promotion of many Indians from the special or local scale to the general scale, adding to the increased cost in some directions; and Honourable Members may rest assured that this aspect of the question will be borne in mind whenever there is any possibility of increasing the Indian element; but I may say that this department is chiefly manned or almost wholly manned by Indians including in that term Anglo-Indians or statutory Indians. Sir, with regard to the printing and stores and similar . . .

Dr. Nand Lal: I made reference specially to the Telegraph Department, not to the Postal Department, so far as the Indian element goes.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: If there be any special grievance which Honourable Members desire to bring to the notice of this department, they would only too readily inquire into them and set right any such grievance as may exist. There was one suggestion made by Dr. Nand Lal with regard to the increased postal rates introduced last year. It is a large question, and I do not want to go into it now. The Department and the Government are as anxious as ever to keep the postage as low as possible. The revised estimate is 969 lakhs as against 905 of 1921 Actuals. Therefore, there is an increase of 64 lakhs, and although I admit that the postage revenue has suffered to a slight extent owing to increased rates, there has been a steady improvement and the figures that we have taken in February last indicate an improvement of about 13 per cent., and we hope during the next year to give the general exchequer as much as 161 lakhs of rupees net. I do not think I need take up the time of the House any more, but I think we have done all that we could to carry out the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee and Honourable Members will not, I hope, suggest any further retrenchments which would be detrimental to the efficient working of the department.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, in view of what has fallen from the Honourable Member in charge, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I intended to raise a very broad question and a very important question too under the head of provision for allowances, honoraria, etc., to the Wireless Branch of this Department, but I do feel, Sir, that this is not the occasion for raising it. I refer to the question of wireless broadcasting in this country and it will require another day for discussion. I heard that my Honourable friend, Sir Sydney Crookshank, is himself going to bring up the subject in the shape of a Resolution. I hope, Sir, the matter will be placed before this Assembly and that no decision will be arrived at before this Assembly has had an opportunity of considering the scheme which I see has already excited a great amount of public comment in consequence of the conference which was held recently. I understand the subject is a very important one and that the department itself would like to discuss it on a separate day.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: I may suggest, Sir, that the question which it was proposed to discuss if time permitted is with regard to the wireless scheme as a whole, and not with regard to wireless broadcasting. But I may assure the House that the scheme that we put forward was for the purpose of eliciting the views of the general public on a tentative embryonic scheme and that we did not want to proceed at all in haste and grant licences without ascertaining what the public opinion was. We have to take sufficient protection to safeguard the interests of the community generally, for promoting the general interests of any Indian companies that may exist or that hereafter be started and also for safeguarding the interests of the press. Any representations that may be received will be fully considered, and I do not think anything will be done hastily. It was with a view, as I said, to elicit public opinion that we have published the draft licences, and we hope the public will kindly cooperate with us. The thing cannot be put off indefinitely. I agree the country has a right to know what we propose to do and we do expect

their co-operation and friendly criticism in that respect, so that the future promotion of wireless broadcasting which we think ought to be assisted may proceed on healthy lines.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: My point is whether this House will have an opportunity to discuss the subject, so that we may offer our criticisms on the proposed measures, if not now, at least in the July session. It is a very important question, and it will not do to merely consult the public and the newspapers, but this House also should have an opportunity to discuss it, and I wish to emphasise it.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, the motion which I beg to move is:

“That the demand under the head ‘Indian Postal and Telegraph Department’ be reduced by Rs. 10,00,000.”

Honourable Members will find from the statement supplied by the Finance Department, under the head Posts and Telegraphs the following statement:

“Excluding Interest on Debt the budget of the Department was about Rs. 9 lakhs above that recommended by the Retrenchment Committee. A further provisional reduction of Rs. 3 lakhs has been made in the provision for expansion of establishment.”

If, I understand this statement aright, it means that 9 lakhs of rupees above that recommended by the Retrenchment Committee was budgeted for and in response to the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee a reduction has been made of 3 lakhs.

(At this stage Mr. President resumed his seat.)

Therefore, 6 lakhs worth of retrenchment recommended by the Inchcape Committee have not been given effect to. It was very refreshing to hear the Honourable Sir Sydney Crookshank reminding the House that the Postal and Telegraph Department is a commercial Department. Now, Sir, if we turn to this commercial Department, what do we find? The Honourable the Finance Member in his budget statement referred to this Department in the following terms:

“The effect of the new postal rates during the first few months of the financial year was to reduce correspondence. There have since been signs of recovery and the public are now getting gradually used to the higher postal charges. For the present, however, I think we must anticipate a diminution of 106 lakhs in our anticipated receipts in 1922 and 1923. There is a small saving in working expenses and, after debiting interest, the Department will probably prove to have been run on a profit of about 24 lakhs.”

Do Honourable Members realise what this statement means? It means that this commercial Department of the Government of India spends about 100 per cent. upon its management and the outturn is either *nil* or negligible. That is the first thing Honourable Members must bear in mind. Another question that Honourable Members cannot forget is the discussion we had in this House last year when the postal and telegraph vote was under discussion. The Honourable Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, speaking on behalf of the Posts and Telegraphs, justified the increased postal rates on the ground that it would bring more income and wipe out the deficit and with the surplus there would be expansion of the Post Office. He pathetically referred to certain struggling Post Offices which would have to be closed if we did not accede to the increased postal rates. That appeal

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

was not unsuccessful. But what has been the result? The Honourable the Finance Member's statement and the statement reiterated in brief by the Honourable Mr. Sarma has told us that the expansion of postal traffic has not been commensurate with the increased postage. On the contrary, the postal receipts have gone down in consequence partially of the increased postage. Now, Sir, I submit every economist knows that a time comes when what we call the saturation point is reached in taxation, and so far as postal rates are concerned, I submit that saturation point was reached last year, and the more you tax, the less you are likely to get out of that Department. I therefore submit that the first and dire necessity that confronts us as regards the management of the Post and Telegraph Department is drastic retrenchment. Now, in this connection, the Retrenchment Committee have made some caustic references to the inefficient management of the Post and Telegraph Department. My friend the Honourable Mr. Sarma has already referred to a few of their recommendations. Let me categorise them for the benefit of the Honourable Members. In the first place, they say that while during the last ten years under review the officers have increased by 32 per cent., the staff has only increased by 17 per cent. In this connection I have not overlooked the explanation given by the Honourable Mr. Sarma to which I shall presently advert. Then the Retrenchment Committee point out that the staff is excessive. Thirdly, they point out that the cost of travelling allowances is also excessive. Fourthly, they point out that there has been a great waste in stationery and printing. Let me give you one illustration culled from the Retrenchment Committee's own report. Last year they printed 50 millions of telegraph forms. But how many were really utilised? You will never guess it. Only 20 millions. The rest were all scrapped. (*A Voice*: "Whose fault is that?" and other interruptions.) I am coming to that. Then, Sir, the Retrenchment Committee point out that the staff of the officers of these two Departments get free quarters and houses to live in and they deprecate the giving of these houses free of charge to the officers of the Department and insist that a reasonable rent must be demanded of them. Lastly, they come to the question which one of my interjectors referred to, namely, the large accumulation of stores. Honourable Members will observe that the Government of India is more or less a Government of the Stores Department. No less than Rs. 59 crores worth of stores are lying stocked or imbedded in the depôts of the Government of India. The Inchcape Committee have pointed out that this very large collection of stores which is daily deteriorating is inadvisable and that it should be disposed of to the advantage of the State. Now, in connection with the subject of Posts and Telegraphs they equally advise the Government not to make these large collections of stores for postal and telegraph purposes. Now, if these criticisms of the Retrenchment Committee are given due effect to, I have no doubt that the small sum of Rs. 10 lakhs when compared with the colossal figure of 8 odd crores of rupees would be, I submit, a very small percentage of economy which this House must ask the Post and Telegraph Department to make during the ensuing year. I feel, Sir, that there is absolutely no justification for not effecting the economy which we demand. I said at the commencement of my speech that I shall not forget to advert to the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Sarma. My Honourable friend has developed a true and genuine bureaucratic spirit. Whenever any question is put to him he tells us that the subject is under consideration. Whenever any demand is made it

will receive his sympathy, but beyond consideration and sympathy it does not go. Now, Sir, we are here not to invest in sympathies and considerations but to compel the occupants of the Treasury Benches to make themselves responsive to the will of the people's representatives in this House, and I submit that we shall not hear year after year these bureaucratic shibboleths which are hurled at us and have been hurled at us during the last three years, "The matter is receiving due and sympathetic consideration." We shall judge of their acts by the results and not by the promises and I think that the least that we can do in connection with the subject of Posts and Telegraphs is to ask my Honourable friend the Member in charge to set his house in order by cultivating a little more of the commercial spirit to which the Honourable Sir Sydney Crookshank adverted and run this Department as any businessman, as any commercial man will do. Why, Sir? There are many ornaments of the commercial firms in this House. If I tell any one of them that I am going to embark on trade and I am spending 9 crores of rupees, at the end of the year either to lose 10 lakhs or to make this small pittance of Rs. 10 or 20 lakhs with the qualification and the necessary qualification of "probably" being superadded to my profits, what will be the result? The commercial expert will say, "Wind up your business. You are incapable and incompetent to run a business from which you can make no profit," yet we are told that this is a commercial department which requires every sympathy and consideration of the Members of this House. It is needless for me to point out that if we ask this House for a cut of Rs. 10 lakhs we are not doing much more than what the Retrenchment Committee have themselves recommended, and allowing for that most felicitous expression with which the Honourable the Finance Member has made the Members of this House by this time sufficiently familiar,—allowing for the lag, I am sure that the sum of Rs. 10 lakhs which we cut out of the budget for Posts and Telegraphs is as reasonable a cut as we should expect in the circumstances of the case. My friend the Honourable Mr. Sarma anticipated some of the arguments which were likely to be raised in the course of this debate by referring to one or two points. He first of all said and that was no doubt a statement which the Honourable Sir Sydney Crookshank stated that if we are to make any cuts at all, it would lead to widespread discontent. Now, Sir, whoever ever thought in a commercial department of making increases of salary and fearing economy on the ground that the employees will say "We do not like it." I am sure, Sir, that when the cuts are made people who are affected by the cuts do not like it at all. But that is a piece of unpopularity to which all departments are subject, to which all commercial houses are subject but the fact that it will lead to discontent in certain quarters should not, deter the Honourable Member in charge from bringing into practice the principle which he himself has been enunciating, that this department must be run on a truly commercial and economical line. Then, Sir, I find that the Honourable Members are bubbling with enthusiasm to vote for my motion. I shall therefore be brief. My friend the Honourable Member in charge has said that there has been increase in the percentage of officers due to revision of pay. That may account for the number but it does not and cannot account for the cost. Then turning to the Telegraph Department may I once more recall that hackneyed complaint, complaint hackneyed but yet unredressed, that it has become the monopoly of Europeans and Anglo-Indians, and the sons of the soil are as a body not admitted, within its sacred fold.

Mr. R. A. Spence: Are not Anglo-Indians sons of the soil?

Dr. H. S. Gour: We as the representatives of the people shall not be satisfied till we have seen the Indianisation of at least those services in which the Indians have proved their merit and competency. The Posts and Telegraphs are the departments of State in which the public are vitally and directly interested. They have a right to see that their representatives are admitted into the higher ranks of the Telegraph Department. My friend the Honourable Mr. Sarma made a casual allusion to Anglo-Indians and Europeans employed in the Services. I shall be very much interested to hear if he would vouchsafe some more particular information and give us the figures of the last three years, so that we may carry them to our constituents and tell them what we have done in the way of strengthening the Indianisation of these two services. How many Indians have been admitted into the superior ranks of the Telegraph Department? What was their number three years ago, and what is their number to-day? These are facts, Sir, upon which the Members of this House would like to have some enlightenment. Sir, I move my amendment.

5 P.M.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member move his amendment for reduction of Rs. 10 lakhs? (*Voices:* "Five lakhs.")

Dr. H. S. Gour: Five lakhs.

Mr. President: Amendment moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Indian Postal and Telegraph Department' be reduced by Rs. 5,00,000."

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, and it is because I did not want to take up the time of this House that I did not move several motions that stood in my name. But Dr. Gour has just now set such a bad example to this House that I feel tempted to say a few words. Sir, it has been already observed that the increase of work in the post office has not been commensurate with the increase in the superior staff, and I think the Honourable Mr. Sarma pointed out that there was some misapprehension in regard to the classification of the staff due to the increase of salaries as a result of the last revision. I will, therefore, leave out the superior staff when I give a few figures to this House. The increase of work in the post office has been 35 per cent. if we compare the figures of 1913-14 with those for the year 1921-22. Now, let us see what the increase of staff has been in the different branches of the postal organisation. I leave out the superior staff altogether, the direction and its staff. The increase of clerical staff in the Postmaster-General's offices has been 38 per cent., that is to say, 3 per cent. in excess of the increase in work, and menials in these offices 38 per cent. Then, in the presidency and district offices, postmasters and clerks increased by 28 per cent. as compared with an increase of work of 35 per cent., and the menials in the presidency and district offices increased by 18.8 per cent., and the postmen increased by 11 per cent. as compared with 35 per cent. increase in work.

Now, let us come to the telegraph branch of the combined department. The increase of work in the telegraph branch has been 22 per cent., if we compare the figures for 1913-14 and the figures for 1921-22; and the increase in the number of telegraph masters has been 34 per cent., or 12 per cent. in excess of the increase of work. And, then, the increase of telegraphists

and signal room clerks has been 27 per cent. or 5 per cent. in excess of the increase in work, and the menials in the telegraph department increased by 70 per cent. as compared with the increase of work by 22 per cent. Now, how does the Honourable Member in charge propose to effect the cuts in compliance with the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee? I find that the postmasters, gazetted and non-gazetted, were 7,302 in 1922-23. Their number as given in the paper supplied to us in connection with the budget of this year is 7,278, that is to say, a decrease of 24. Then, again, taking the postmen and the village postmen, their number in 1922-23 was 29,528. Their number as given in the papers in connection with the present budget, is 28,736, the reduction being 792. Let us compare with these figures the reduction proposed under Telegraphs. The Telegraph Masters numbered 335 in 1920-21. Their number has been set down as 353 in the present budget. Now Dr. Gour has already referred to the recommendation of the Inchcape Committee in regard to the question of house rent and allowances enjoyed by the telegraph people. I will now draw the attention of the House to another recommendation of the Inchcape Committee, namely, that the number of Telegraph Masters and telegraphists which stands at 3,426 ought to be reduced to 2,806, that is to say, by 626. I would very much like the Honourable Member in charge to explain as to how he justifies this disparity in the cuts on the two branches of the joint department. Now, Sir, it will be seen that it is the public who are going to be affected by this unusual cut in the number of postal peons and delivery clerks and people whose duties are in connection with the village post offices. But, Sir, what do we find when we come to the higher grades? The number of Superintendents of Post Offices stood at 150 in 1922-23. The Department proposes to cut this down to the remarkably low figure of 145, removing two probationary Superintendents. I may point out to the House the Superintendents' work has been decreased of late years by reason of the curtailment of the number of inspections which they are required to make of the various post offices. I believe about two or three years back they were required to inspect the post offices twice a year, and now they are required to inspect each post office, I believe, once a year only. There is another point. Inspectors are now authorised to inspect more offices. Besides that, when we come to the amount of travelling allowance set down under the head Superintendents we find that the amount has been cut down considerably. That at least shows that the Superintendents are not expected to inspect the post offices as they used to do in the past years. What justification is there therefore for retaining the number of Superintendents at 148? Sir, Dr. Gour in opening his speech, referred to the Postal Department as a commercial department, and he cited the authority of the Honourable the Finance Member in his support. I beg to join issue both with the Honourable Finance Member and Dr. Gour on this point. I think it is a public utility department and it will be wrong on our part to look for any surplus revenue from this department in aid of the general revenues of the country. I believe that the principle which is observed almost throughout the world in regard to this matter, is not to consider the Postal Department to be a commercial department in the strict sense of the term, but to consider it a public utility department, whose primary duty is to assist the public in carrying on their business and thereby indirectly enable Government to benefit by their efforts.

Now, Sir, I propose to deal with this point at some length in connection with the Finance Bill, and, therefore, I do not want to tire the patience of this House now.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: It is a true saying, Sir, that " a little knowledge is a dangerous thing " but it is a truer saying that " no knowledge is crass ignorance ". Dr. Gour has exemplified this and in his usual thunderous way takes every opportunity in this House of bombarding the Members in charge of various Departments for information regarding the community which I have the honour to represent asking what percentage of appointments we hold, etc., notwithstanding the fact, as this House knows, that it is my desire to discourage and disclaim communal preferences. Dr. Gour has to thank my community for his seat in this Assembly, but I shall take good care, Sir, that he will get no more votes from them at the next election. Sir, I rise to strongly protest against the amendment which Dr. Gour has moved and I do so with a certain amount of inside information and knowledge of the Telegraph Department, for I had the honour last year to sit on the Telegraph Committee which inquired into and adjusted certain of the grievances of this Department. I protest against this motion not with any communal feelings or with any desire to satisfy the insatiable appetite of Dr. Gour when anything comes up about my community, but to discuss its merits on the lines indicated by my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy who calls this department one of public utility and not as one of the money making departments of the Central Government. Sir, it was two years ago when discussing the Budget that the Member in charge of this Department openly admitted that he knew very little about the profit and loss of the Post and Telegraph Departments. It possessed no such account. Quite recently two distinct committees have sat to inquire into the details and grievances of this Department. I was on the one which sat last year. We now have the report of the Retrenchment Committee before us. This morning when discussing the Medical Department I paid great attention and respect to the report made by the Retrenchment Committee on that department. I regret to say that I cannot give the same weight to their report on the Telegraph Department. If Honourable Members will turn to page 94 and read the top paragraph of that page they will find it stated :

" It has not been possible for us in the *limited time* at our disposal to make any *exhaustive analysis* of the staff employed in relation to the work performed, but in order to attain a *general impression*, etc., etc."

(The *italics* are mine.) Now, Sir, this paragraph itself condemns the report of this Retrenchment Committee on the Postal and Telegraph Departments and it cannot be compared in value with the reports of the two previous Committees which sat to discuss the detailed working and grievances of this Department. I, therefore, cannot pay much attention to what this Committee has said so far as this Department is concerned. True there is room for some retrenchment in these Departments but certainly not on the lines indicated by this Committee. Let us take the first suggestion on page 94 of this Report—" Reduction in the staff ". Now, Sir, the work performed by the Telegraph Department is essentially a fluctuating one; greater in one month than in another. It usually is. Does the House think that, if a staff of 500 is required for the month of September, that because traffic is less a month hence, the strength of the staff should be proportionately reduced in the interests of economy? Telegraphists are skilled and highly trained men who cannot be taught within a month. You must have a big reserve to fall back upon for all requirements including a leave reserve and, therefore, I submit that any reduction in the staff is not a wise move. Dr. Gour talked about

the waste of millions of telegraph forms that are printed. I wonder how many forms Dr. Gour has wasted for his own use! It is not the Government that is responsible for this waste. It is the public. I wonder how many unused telegraph forms he has hidden away in the drawers of his Vice-Chancellor's office writing table!

Then, Sir, another question very lightly entered into by the Incheape Committee is that of house accommodation and house rent for the staff. Sir, I had a lot to do at the last Telegraph Committee on this very matter, which was brought prominently to our notice, and I am sure Mr. Rangachariar, who was the President of that Committee and who was very averse to agreeing to any increased allowances to the staff, will remember that he himself saw the necessity of granting adequate house allowance when it was absolutely necessary. Sir, I cannot conceive of any Member of this Honourable House giving serious attention to the remarks made in the top paragraph of page 100 of the Retrenchment Committee's Report. This Committee when talking about house accommodation said:

"We are of opinion that in cases where it is necessary to provide quarters for the staff reasonable rents should be charged, and where such accommodation is not available house rent allowances should be granted for a reasonable period until the men transferred have had an opportunity of finding suitable accommodation."

This paragraph alone proves conclusively that this Committee was ignorant of the difficulties in obtaining house accommodation in Simla and Delhi, not to mention other parts of India. I therefore consider it would be a very unwise and unjust retrenchment to make in the house rent of the staff.

Dr. Gour then twitted my Honourable friend, Sir Sydney Crookshank, on the contents of the telegram which he read out to the House as reflexive of the personal views of the Telegraph staff regarding the retrenchments suggested by the Incheape Committee and tried to belittle its value and weight. Let me in all the seriousness and emphasis at my command inform Dr. Gour—I notice a sardonic smile developing on his face—that whatever his feelings are towards any community and their supposed monopoly of this Department and which I challenge, I wish to impress upon him this one fact: The Telegraph Department constitutes one of, if not the most, delicate and important wheels in the Government clock, and I would advise him and this Honourable House not to undervalue this wheel—not to understaff the men working this wheel—not to underpay the men who control this wheel and not to underestimate the telegram read out by Sir Sydney Crookshank, otherwise they will overstrain the working of this wheel; and I hesitate to think what will be the result if that wheel in the Government clock were so overstrained as to stop working. I offer this note of caution and advice for the serious consideration of this Honourable House and I strongly urge you to oppose this demand and so show your appreciation of a Department which has always done its best for the country and risen to all occasions.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I have sometimes felt that being on Committees is sometimes a convenience and sometimes an inconvenience. I could be a popular champion to-day in opposing extravagance and advocating economy to-day if I had not some inside knowledge of the difficulties that the Postal and Telegraph Departments have to grapple with. Sir, from the year 1918 onwards serious crises have been averted by the tact, prescience and careful handling of the situation which was shown by the Government from time to time. Sir, let us remember that

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

we are dealing with the human element, mostly educated human element, in both these Departments. We are not dealing with inanimate things like Stores. The army of postal officials, the army of telegraph officials, who are scattered throughout the country from north to south and from east to west—we have to take their position into account in dealing with this question. Sir, my Honourable friend Colonel Gidney has referred to one portion of the Inchcape Committee's Report; I wish to speak always with the greatest respect of that Committee. In this matter of free house allowances, however, to these officials of these departments I cannot but think that they have made a grave blunder. Sir, remember that these postal and telegraph officials have to be at their post of duty at all hours of the day and night to obey the calls of the public. Have you seen the telegraph officials, those of you who take so much interest, have you seen the telegraph officials working in Simla? Have you seen them without house accommodation being provided there, they have to walk up to the Telegraph Office on the Mall, nearly four or five miles from far away residences? Sir, they have to go there at 10 o'clock at night; their shift hours change; they do not get all day hours; they have to go at their shift hours; they have to go at 8 o'clock at night and leave at 3 or 4 A.M. for their homes. Is it just to compare these people with other Government servants who have to go at fixed office hours, just as in revenue offices or courts where you can go at 10 o'clock and get back home at 5 or 6 in the evening? Sir, there are Government servants and Government servants. It is a very large question as to who you should provide accommodation for, and I think the rules made by the Government of India in that respect do not at all err on the side of humanity. I have examined those rules with care and I find that it is difficult to impose more restrictions than there are already in them.

Again, Sir, I called for a statement showing how the retrenchment proposed by the Committee has been carried out. The chapter on Posts and Telegraphs is one of those interesting chapters where the Retrenchment Committee have been able to go through the matter most thoroughly, for it is one of the earliest subjects they took up, and the then Director General of Post Offices was supplé in their hands. They discussed every proposal with him and I find almost all these proposals carried out. If Honourable Members will compare the figures recommended by the Committee and the figures carried out, Honourable Members will really be surprised at the effort put forward by that department in loyally carrying out these recommendations. The figures tell their own tale. Honourable Members will see the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee came to 137 lakhs and they have actually carried out 131 lakhs. I have not worked out the percentage. Has any other department carried out the recommendations to that extent, may I ask? I am afraid, Sir, my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, unfortunately had to deal with this department; if he had any prior motion under any other department I should have heartily supported him. But here he has touched a place where in fact it is impossible to make further cuts without sacrificing efficiency and without sacrificing human beings.

Sir, I know quite well that a certain portion of the Telegraph Department known as the general scale was some years ago avowedly kept for a particular community and in fact the Government of India of those days had a secret confidential Resolution on this subject. But I am glad to say that that Resolution has been cancelled. Now, Sir, in the general

scale of telegraphists a larger number of Indians have been taken into service. I can assure my friend Dr. Gour that progress is being made, but progress can only be made. You cannot kill people who are already in service. They have to go; vacancies should occur before you can introduce Indians, and I do think that an honest effort is being made in introducing Indians in the general scale of telegraphists. I have not got the figures with me here,—I have them in Madras,—but I am sure the Honourable Member in charge will be able to tell us those figures, in fact, it will also be a revelation to my friend Dr. Gour, if the Honourable Member in charge will show him my confidential report which accompanied the general report as President of the Telegraph Committee. Sir, matters are improving, and I am glad to say they are improving. I am sure some of my friends behind me are not satisfied with the progress made. I may also share in their dissatisfaction, but after all, we can bring pressure to bear upon the department. I do not think we have much reason to complain of the Postal Department. If Honourable Members will look at the postal establishment, they will see that there is a very large proportion of Indians in the officers' grades. In the telegraph line, it requires technical training, and facilities have to be created in this country; especially in the engineering department there are not now so many facilities and the Government ought to provide them in this country. All these things do take time, and I do think, Sir, that we should be unkind to a department like this which is serving the public honestly and faithfully. Now, can you think of a department where it is so easy to be dishonest? Letters are addressed to you, and you don't know what letters are addressed to you, and you get them all right. Look to the regularity of the service. Is it not easy for the poor postman to merely throw away those letters and say he delivered them? Are there many complaints to the effect that the addressees do not receive their letters? Take the money order system. Look at the large sums of money which are remitted by Money Orders and handled by these postal officials. Are there many cases of misappropriation and theft? There are no doubt, but they are very few.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May you not pay too much for a good thing?

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: That is a point of view, no doubt, but I do think it is not possible to estimate these things from outside. May I with all respect to Dr. Gour point out that it is more for the persons in charge of the department to know these things rather for us to offer criticisms on such details. By all means let us offer criticisms on broad principles. I ask my Honourable friend Mr. Raju not to treat my remarks with that smile with which he greets them. I know he pointed out this morning a paragraph about allowances. It is there the Retrenchment Committee have egregiously erred, I am sorry to say. However, I hope, Sir, my friend will not press this motion. It will be an unpleasant task to differ from him on a matter like this, but if he presses this motion to a division, I shall certainly record my vote against him.

Mr. R. A. Spence: I move, Sir, that the question be put.

Mr. H. A. Sams (Director General: Posts and Telegraphs): Sir, before I pass on to my remarks on the criticisms passed on the department, I should like first of all to point out a matter which I do not think the House has quite realised. The budget estimate for 1922-23 was 10,17,00,000, as you will see on page 109 of the Inchcape Committee's

[Mr. H. A. Sams.]

Report. I want the House to realise this that assuming that this sum had been taken as the basis of our budget for 1923-24 it would have had to be automatically increased by two items. One is an increase of 13½ lakhs for increments of the staff which are absolutely automatic; the other is 6½ lakhs for the effects of sanctions, that is to say, that, if we appoint a clerk this year on an average of 6 months, we have obviously to pay him for 12 months next year; if the rent of a house is increased Rs. 100, that is to say Rs. 600 for this year, it will obviously be Rs. 1,200 next year. To the best of my knowledge, the Inchcape Committee did not take that into account. But our figure Rs. 8,93,18,000 does include these increases. What I claim therefore is not only that we have not done less than what the Inchcape Committee recommended; we have actually gone further. They did not take these items into account and we have. I want the House please clearly to understand that and especially my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour. He says that we are under the mark; I claim very distinctly that we are actually over the mark.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Mr. Misra has twitted us with making our cuts from the lower end of the Department instead of from the higher. I may tell him, as perhaps he is not aware—one of our handicaps is that while the Honourable Members of this House do not exactly know what positions we have already won, we on the other hand do not exactly know where they are going to attack. I want to tell Mr. Misra that three very high officers have been dispensed with this year already, namely, the Traffic Controller on the Telegraph side, a Deputy Postmaster General in Bombay, and an Assistant Director General of my office. I think that this is an earnest that we are not trying to cut down only from the lower end of the line.

Dr. Nand Lal made a remark about printing. I may inform him, as perhaps he is not aware of the fact that we get our forms from two sources, one is the Government contractors, a private firm, which is under the Industries Department and therefore is not under our control at all. The other is our own Postal Workshops at Aligarh. I mention this for Dr. Nand Lal's information.

Dr. Nand Lal: I was really referring to the work done at Aligarh. My submission was that the printing may be done through private agency. The Government should not get itself associated with that at all.

Mr. H. A. Sams: I can tell the Honourable Member that, as a matter of fact, at Aligarh, taking everything into consideration, we can print 20 per cent. cheaper than a private firm can. As regards stores, my Department will be only too glad if we can get the whole of our stores in India. Waiting about for stores to come from England not only increases our stocks but also costs very much more than we need pay. I will mention only one item, it is a very big item—which we cannot at present get in India, and that is wire. Now, Sir, the whole of our Telegraph Department turns on that. We talk about wires, we send wires, we receive wires, you see stranded wires along every mile you travel by train. Every inch of that wire has to come from England. And I for one am sure that our Engineering Branch will be only too glad when India herself can produce wire—it will be a magnificent industry for India.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally: What about the printing of postage stamps.

Mr. H. A. Sams: That is a matter with which my Department is curiously and paradoxically enough not concerned. It belongs to the Industries Department. We simply buy our stamps from them. We buy our stamps from the Treasuries and perhaps my Honourable friend Mr. Ley will be able to give you further information on that subject.

Sir, I have already answered my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, on the question of our having made a less cut than the Inchcape Committee required. I hope I have satisfied him on that point. He has told the House that the postage has gone down. This is an important question—Rs. 12 lakhs more actually than was recommended—and I should like Dr. Gour kindly to listen to this. Here are the figures for the sale of postage stamps in 1921-22 and 1922-23. I will take the first month. In April 1921-22 the sales were 71,99,000; in this April they were 56,35,000. Of course Dr. Gour will immediately say "Obviously the postage has gone down." But I may remind Dr. Gour that the new postage rates came into existence on the 24th of April. It shows, therefore, conclusively I think, Sir, that some other condition, something else was operating and not merely the higher rate of postage stamps. As a matter of fact, taking into account receipts from the National Cash Registers in Bombay and Calcutta, which are practically the same as stamps, the total for 1921-22 was 6,51,00,000, while this year, taking the average—we have not yet got the actual figures,—it will be 7,12,00,000, that is to say, we shall be at the end of the year 6 lakhs to the good on the sale of postage stamps and receipts of National Cash Registers. That, I think, is satisfactory, and the House can imagine what our figures would have been if we had not raised the postage. Dr. Gour has mentioned travelling allowance. He will see that we have cut that down by Rs. 8,55,000. Personally I regret this step. I am convinced that every touring officer justifies every penny that is spent on travelling allowance. However, this is a lean year and the Department has among other items cut down the travelling allowances ruthlessly.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally: Is it a fact that every Superintendent of the Post Office whatever his pay travels first class?

Mr. H. A. Sams: I cannot go into that question now. I am not prepared to discuss the whole of the travelling allowance rules.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Why can't you?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Colonel Gidney has answered Dr. Gour on the question of forms but I may inform the House of a rather amusing incident that happened the other day when a lady told me that a certain fruit-seller in Delhi was spreading out his wares on postal money order forms. The abuse of forms does not lie with us. It lies with the public. Either they get more forms than they require or as I am inclined to think some of them got forms which they do not intend to use for their legitimate purposes but for other purposes. I have issued a circular prohibiting the giving of bunches of forms to the public.

Mr. Darcy Lindsay: Why not charge for them?

Mr. H. A. Sams: That is practically impossible. The question of House rent has been ably dealt with by my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar who in this respect, and I may say in every respect, is a champion of the Department, and I thank him sincerely for championing that particular cause. (A Voice: "He is a bureaucrat.")

[Mr. H. A. Sams.]

I am glad to see that in this respect he has ranged himself on the side of the noble army of bureaucrats. Dr. Gour criticised the question of stores, and there I am entirely in agreement with him. In October-November last an officer was put on special duty to examine the whole question of stores in the Posts and Telegraph Department and the conclusion that he came to was that we could reduce the stocks very considerably and that if we could only get more articles in India, we could reduce them to a very much greater extent. It has been said that Indians are not getting a fair share of the loaves and fishes of the Department. I may say that on the Telegraph side there was recently a Chief Engineer who was an Indian, with an eye-glass, but still an Indian. The Chief Electrician is an Indian and a very able and clever one. The Traffic Controller, as long as the appointment existed, was an Indian and the Controller of Stores is an Indian. These are a few of the higher appointments which come to my mind. The postal side, as you know, has always been an Indianised Department practically from the very start. Mr. Neogy has insinuated to a certain extent that the cuts we have made have been not altogether fairly done. I can assure Mr. Neogy,—and I hope that he will take my word for it, because I was present at the meeting when Mr. Clarke and the other officers of the Department went through the Budget and made the cuts—that there was no question whatever of cutting more from one Branch than from another. We simply considered each particular item and we decided whether we could cut it out or cut it down or whether we could not do so. I will ask Mr. Neogy to accept my assurance on that point. Mr. Rangachariar has made a small mistake. He has assumed that the Inchcape Committee dictated to my predecessor. That I can assure him was not the case. The Inchcape Committee asked him to do what he could. Mr. Clarke and his principal officers met together on a historic Sunday, stayed in office the whole day long and the four of us went through the budget of 1922-23 and then Mr. Clarke told the Committee what we could do. Subsequently, we found that we could do a certain amount of more retrenchment. But it was Mr. Clarke who told the Committee what he could do, and I think it is rather a feather in our cap that the Committee agreed with him rather than that he agreed with them. I do not want to detain the House any longer as it is getting late. But what I want the House to realise is that the budget we put forward is an estimate only. It does not represent a correct and accurate account. We can only say what we think we shall want. If we find we do not want it it will be saved. What I do want to assure the House is that we have honestly tried to effect retrenchment in view of the present serious financial situation. We have made great sacrifices and it will be very difficult to carry on, I am almost certain that during the course of the year we shall have to go to the Standing Finance Committee for more money in certain respects. But I do want the House to be generous to us and to realise the fact that we have really and honestly done our best to meet the present financial situation.

Dr. H. S. Gour: In view of the assurance given by the Honourable Member that he merely thinks what he wants and that he will see that real economies will be effected in the Department on the lines indicated by ourselves on this side of the House, and more in view of the fact that a House divided against itself cannot stand, I wish to withdraw this motion.

Mr. President: Is it your pleasure that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. R. A. Spence: I object.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the demand under the head ‘Indian Postal and Telegraph Department’ be reduced by Rs. 5 lakhs.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. J. N. Mukherjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): I wanted to raise a question about one branch under this demand, namely, broadcasting

Mr. President: It is very inconvenient that the Honourable Member should raise this point at this stage. It would help the Chair if only Honourable Members would rise in their places before the question is put on a general reduction such as we have just disposed of, otherwise there would be too much repetition. I deliberately did not call upon the Acting Director General when he rose for the first time because other Members wished to speak, and I did not want him to have to speak twice. So far as I remember, the Honourable Member did not rise in his seat.

Mr. J. N. Mukherjee: I unfortunately did not catch your eye.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is perfectly entitled to move his amendment but it is inconvenient especially at this late stage of the discussion of the Demands to ask for two speeches from the post office, when one will do. (*A Voice:* “The question has been discussed already.”)

Mr. Deputy President: That is so.

Mr. President: That only makes the position of the Honourable Member worse.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,07,98,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of the ‘Indian Postal and Telegraph Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: I should like to say, if I am in order, that I hope that nothing will be done to interfere with the extension of the post offices in the villages. That is a very desirable thing. In this connection I should like to say

Mr. President: Is the Honourable Member rising on a personal point of order?

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Yes. In this connection I should like to point out, if I understood the Honourable the Leader of the House aright, that he seems to have used the expression that my friend, Mr. Ginwala, was wasting the time of the House, when he was speaking on the general administration. Sir, none is more considerate to Members of this House than the Leader of the House and I do not think that he really intended to convey that imputation against my friend. It may be that myself and my friend have not understood the Honourable the Leader of the House properly; and I believe he would give us an assurance that he did not intend to convey the imputation that my friend was wasting the time of the House.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I was not conscious that I used that phrase; but I am reminded that I did so, and desire therefore to recall the circumstances to the House. What I was protesting against was the proposal that we should have a discussion on the whole conduct of Government, in every department, and in every sphere of activity, on a final motion for a grant which, as I have already pointed out, related to the head under which we provide funds for the Secretariat and the Legislative bodies. My remarks were directed mainly to a protest against utilising that opportunity instead of taking the occasion which the rules provided, namely, of the general discussion of the Budget. I would like to add that I regret to realise that it was Mr. Ginwala whom I accuse of wasting the time of the House; for, we know Mr. Ginwala is a constant attendant at the meetings of the House and one who always speaks to the point and, if I may be allowed to say so, never speaks too often. My remarks were intended to be of a general nature, and if they were couched in somewhat warmer terms than I have frequently used in this House, then, I would only ask Members opposite to remember that Mr. Ginwala made, at what seemed to me a most inopportune occasion, a general attack on our administration and made certain insinuations against us. Now, I felt very much the terms in which the insinuations against the Government were couched, for I say with some confidence that nobody has worked harder than we, the present Members of the Government, to maintain good faith with Members of this House. I would remind the House of what was once said by a Judge in Ireland: he asked people to remember that even the common policeman who walked the streets had a soul. If insinuations of that kind are made against us, we must resent them. If we are to be attacked, I ask that we be attacked in season and not out of season. I ask again that we may be attacked for our vices and not for our virtues. Thus, when we had been asked to make a small retrenchment of 25 lakhs and we succeed in making a retrenchment of over a crore, it was not reasonable to impute this to us for blame. Those were the kind of attacks that I resented. Well, it was far from my desire to accuse Mr. Ginwala of a practice of wasting the time of the House; but I did feel that the occasion for those attacks was misplaced; I did feel that they were out of season, I did feel the insinuations made were unreasonable, and that we were entitled to resent them.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: Sir, I do not wish to lose the very good opinion of the Honourable the Home Member which he expressed when he said that I did not speak too often, by refraining from speaking a few words now. I do not think that the Honourable the Home Member can charge me with insinuation. I do not believe I insinuate anything at all, for I am rather like the Irishman who told a man that he wanted to give him a hint, and when asked what the hint was, he said: "Somebody has stolen my coat, and I think it is you." That is the way in which I generally make my insinuation and I am sorry to think that I have not made my observations sufficiently plain for the Honourable the Home Member to take them as criticisms, and not as insinuations. However, so far as I am concerned, I may assure the Honourable the Home Member that I indulge myself very much in free criticism of the Government and I expect the same thing from the Government as far as I am concerned, and nothing that he said today put me out in the least. I may perhaps add that if the Honourable the Home Member had not shown a little bit of temper, I should have taken him for a mediocrity. I am very much obliged to the Honourable the Home Member for having spoken as he has done.

DEMAND NO. 11—INDO-EUROPEAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank: Sir, I move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘the Indo-European Telegraph Department’.”

Sir, before we enter upon a debate on the amendments which have been tabled on this Demand, perhaps it will assist Honourable Members if I just briefly explain in as few words as possible what the position is in regard to this particular department. It is a department which is managed entirely by the Director in Chief, whose headquarters are in England. The Government of India have very little to do with it, that is to say as regards the direct administration and control of the department, and only deals with such correspondence on routine and departmental matters which come through my office in connection with matters of general administration and international questions. We are therefore in the position of the man who lies in bed all the year round and at the end of the year stretches out his hand and picks up a large sum of money for which he has done nothing. In the case of the year 1921-22, which is the last year for which I have detailed information, the Government of India picked up a net profit of Rs. 8,49,518. This I may remark was rather less than what it had been in previous years, but that is due not to any fault on the part of the Director in Chief, or the Government of India, but to the chaotic conditions in Russia and in the Balkans by which the telegraphic communications beyond Teheran and Pao were interrupted and are still interrupted. We must therefore look upon the gift which we receive in the shape of revenue in the Indo-European Telegraph Department for which we do nothing not too closely. If Honourable Members will refer to page 115 of the Inchcape Committee's Report, they will find the total of the budget items for 1922-23 amounts to Rs. 43,35,000. Against that figure for the current year the Committee have recommended a reduction of Rs. 7,34,000. Honourable Members will observe that the proportion of reduction to the total expenditure is a very large one indeed. However, after careful consideration in the Government of India and reference to the Director in Chief I am able to inform the House that this reduction of Rs. 7,34,000 will be effected in full during the following year. We should perhaps, in considering the amendments, be careful not to do too much to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: Sir, I move the amendment:

“That the demand under the head ‘Indo-European Telegraph Department’ (page 32) be reduced by Rs. 2,11,500.”

Now, my intention is not to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

6 P.M. My demand really amounts to asking that the sum of Rs. 2,25,000, which you find as Capital Outlay in Demand No. 11, the whole of which is votable, be transferred to Capital Account and not be charged to Revenue. Therefore, the goose remains and the golden eggs also remain. The House will find at page 122 of the Inchcape Committee's Report that the Honourable Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas has written a minute of dissent on it, and he has pointed out that this is a commercial department which has been very remunerative to the Government of India, having yielded on the capital sum a return varying from 4.46 per cent. in 1913-14 to 14.58 in 1919-20 after allowing for a sinking

[Mr. N. M. Samarth.]

fund of 1 per cent. for depreciation of plant, and he goes on to say, however, that no commercial accounts are kept in this Department. Later, in paragraph 3, he complains:

“The Committee were unable to go into the expenditure of this Department in detail as no one in the Secretariat at Delhi could give further information in connection with this Department; and the Director, Persian Gulf Section, who interviewed the Committee, could not give detailed information regarding the Persian Section of the Department.”

However, it has been shown by the Honourable Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas in that minute that this is a very paying Department. There is already provision for the sinking fund and all I ask is that our expenditure be reduced by the proper entry being made in this connection, namely, transferring that item to Capital Outlay. Now, in my amendment I deduct from the Rs. 2,25,000 interest at 6 per cent. and my figure, therefore, stands at Rs. 2,11,500, which, I claim, should be transferred to Capital Outlay. I give 6 per cent. interest on it, so that in 16 years' time the whole amount is paid off. I really do not know why our expenditure should be swollen by this entry, which I consider to be wrong and to that extent that our deficit should be swollen. I therefore move this amendment of mine.

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank: Sir, perhaps I ought to explain in connection with this Capital Outlay that the capital invested in the Indo-European Telegraph Department has been met from the revenue account. The total capital now amounts to about Rs. 187 lakhs and this amount is being gradually wiped out by an annual amortization of one lakh of rupees, the item for which will be found at page 69 of the Yellow Book. The reason, I presume, for this transaction is that the contracts with the Persian Government expire in the year 1945, by which time the lines, which are the property of Government, will revert to the Persian Government. The capital has not, so far as I know, been met from loan funds, but is all capital charged to revenue and for the year 1923-24, *vide* the detailed accounts which will be found at page 69, it will be seen that the capital account stands at a figure of *minus* Rs. 4,15,800. The reason for this *minus* adjustment is that there are certain credits, one for example of Rs. 3,18,000, which is a contribution which is made by the British Treasury. The nett result is that the capital grant this year is a *minus* quantity.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: There is no capital charge to Revenue this year at all. On the other hand, we gain something.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: You ask in the original demand for Rs. 22,24,000. The entry for Capital outlay in India is all right as a *minus* quantity because in India on account of my motion in 1921 you have separated the capital outlay from the revenue expenditure accounts, but I am talking of the England amount, which is charged to revenue and included in the sum that you ask us to vote.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, this question is entirely sprung on me so far as I am concerned. The explanation which I have had in common with the House leaves me, I imagine, at least as much mystified as the rest of the House, and I would suggest, if we are really going to

reduce a minus quantity, we shall increase our deficit. I shall be very happy indeed, in consultation with the Honourable Member in charge of the Posts and Telegraph Department, to find out what this sum really is; but I do not think that it would be wise for us in our complete ignorance to increase the deficit by voting for this reduction.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: In view of that, Sir, I do not press my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘the Indo-European Telegraph Department’.”

Munshi Iswar Saran: Sir, there is an amendment* standing in my name, if you please. I only wish to obtain a little information. We know that on account of this Indo-European Telegraph Department, since 1913-14, we have made a profit of over £808,000 without the Indo-European Telegraph Department having been in operation at all. During the War it has not been in operation, but according to a certain working arrangement we have received this profit. There is a slight suggestion made by the Incheape Committee that, if possible, this should be sold off. From the report we find that Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas raised his voice against this suggestion. I wish to know whether, if this sale is intended, this House will be consulted before the transaction is completed.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: This is a question which has to be considered and which is being considered from more aspects than one. We shall have to surrender this property under certain conditions. The agreement entered into with the Persian Government terminates at the end of a definite period and we felt that it was desirable that we should reduce our commitments outside India as far as possible; so there was a suggestion made that if we could get back our capital without any loss whatsoever, it may be desirable to part with this property and to utilise the capital in other directions. But it is only a suggestion that has been made and nothing has come out of it so far. But I am sure the Government, if the House so wishes, would consult their wishes before they carry out negotiations any further.

Munshi Iswar Saran: I do not wish to move the amendment, Sir.

Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I only want, Sir, to get some information with regard to the Resolution† that stands in my name (No. 227), in regard to two points. At page 122 of the minute of dissent of the Honourable Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas, it will be seen that the headquarters of the department are in London under the control of the Secretary of State, and the suggestion is made as to why it should not be transferred to Delhi. I want to know whether any steps have been taken to comply with this suggestion of Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas. That is my first point. The

* “That the demand under the head ‘Indo-European Telegraph Department’ be reduced by Re. 1.”

† “That the demand under the head ‘Indo-European Telegraph Department’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar.]

second point is this, namely, that he states in paragraph 5 of his minute of dissent that he has not been able to understand the reasons why the Indian Posts and Telegraph Department should have taken over the Meshed-Seistan-Duzdap line, entailing a cost of upkeep amounting to Rs. 1,12,000 in 1921-22 and Rs. 1,22,000 in 1922-23. He further says: "A complete examination of the liabilities which are at present incurred by the Government of India in connection with this Department, and particularly in connection with the Meshed-Seistan line and the Wireless stations in Persia appears to be necessary." If this suggestion is good, I desire to know whether the Government of India have taken any steps in view to comply with it. If really it is taken over in Imperial interests, then is it not desirable that the Imperial Government should give the whole cost or at least contribute a moiety of the amount?

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: With regard to the first point, Sir, it was a suggestion made by the Government of India to the Secretary of State that this control might be transferred from the Secretary of State to the High Commissioner and the matter is being pursued; no definite decision has been come to. With regard to the second question, we shall have to take the system as a whole and we cannot say that we will have only the profitable part. We do mean, however, having regard to the observations made in the Retrenchment Committee Report, to pursue the suggestion made there and ascertain as to whether the recommendation made is feasible and certainly we will see that the Government of India is not unnecessarily charged with any liability which it can avoid.

Sir Montagu Webb: Sir, the Inchcape Committee for certain Departments have recommended that a Financial Adviser should be appointed to assist the department concerned, and I would seriously suggest that a Financial or Accounts Adviser be appointed for the Indo-European Telegraph Department. Most of the payments,—past, present and future—are *minus* figures, and I confess that after giving a good deal of attention to the Indo-European Telegraph accounts, I cannot make head or tail of them!

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of 'The Indo-European Telegraph Department'."

The motion was adopted.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DISCUSSION ON DEMANDS.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, may I say one word? In view of the peculiar conditions of this year arising out of the Inchcape Committee's recommendations, you will have noticed that many Honourable Members had suggestions to make during the demands. I do not know whether, Sir, it is not possible for the Honourable Finance Member or for the Leader of the House to obtain from His Excellency the Governor General two more days for these demands.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I am afraid, Sir, that in view of the state of the business of the House at the present moment that suggestion is one which is obviously beyond the capacity of the Government.

to grant. The time at our disposal next week and the week after is very limited; we have a good deal of financial business to get through before the 1st of April, and there are a certain number of other questions all of which also have to be cleared up before the end of the session. In the circumstances of the day, therefore, I think it would be obviously impossible that we should give any more time than the six full days which have been given this year. I should be very glad to inquire from the Leader of the House whether he disagrees.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock, on Saturday, the 17th March, 1923.
